DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 956 HE 003 100

AUTHOR	Glenny, Lyman A., Ed.; Weathersby, George B., Ed.
TITLE	Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design.
INSTITUTION	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
PUB DATE	Sep 71
NOTE	133p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, P.O. Box P, Boulder, Colorado 80302 ($3.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Development; *Educational Planning; *Educational Research; *Higher Education; *Management; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this publication are twofold: (1) to provide a state-of-the-art discussion of statewide planning for postsecondary education for the wide audience of the higher education community; and (2) to identify major areas amenable to future research and development of improved statewide planning and management systems. The contents of the document focus first on the current issues, organizational structures, and trends in alternative objectives and managerial procedures available to educational leaders. Finally, the authors address considerations of how to effect change in educational curricula and how institutions will respond to improved statewide planning. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION:

Issues and Design

Edited by

LYMAN A. GLENNY AND GEORGE B. WEATHERSBY

ED 062 956

The Publication has been supported by ESSO Foundation Funds
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Post Office Drawer P Boulder, Colorado 80302

September 1971

Additional copies available, $3.50

HE 003 100

CONTENTS

Preface iv

Introduction vi

Part I — Issues in Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education

1. Issues Related to the Purposes of Postsecondary Education.. 1

2. Current Statewide Planning Structures and Powers..... 19

3. Future Challenges and Trends in Postsecondary Education.. 40

Part II — Design for Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education

4. Alternative Conceptual Models of Postsecondary Education 60

5. Alternative Managerial Approaches to Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education..... 73

6. How to Get the Faculty to Teach..... 87

7. Statewide Planning and the Individual Institution's Response 103

Bibliography 115

Seminar Participants 120

PREFACE

The purposes of this publication are twofold: (a) to provide a state-of-the-art discussion of statewide planning for postsecondary education for the wide audience of the higher education community; and (b) to identify major areas amenable to future research and development of improved statewide planning and management systems. The contents of this document focus first on the current issues, organizational structures, and trends in statewide planning for postsecondary education and then on alternative objectives and managerial procedures available to educational leaders. Finally, the authors address considerations of how to effect change in educational curricula and how institutions will respond to improved statewide planning.

The papers were prepared for a national invitational seminar on statewide planning for postsecondary education. The seminar was conducted by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE in cooperation with the American Council on Education, the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, the Education Commission of the States, and the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.

The initial scope and content outline of this volume were selected by a small editorial committee who commissioned the initial preparation and conducted the review of the first drafts of each of the papers. Subsequent drafts were circulated to a larger group of critics and reviewers for their evaluation and suggestions. This volume has benefited greatly from the many comments received from participants at the seminar and the wider group of critics and reviewers.

A special word of appreciation is due the staff of the participating organizations who typed and edited many drafts of the various chapters. Special recognition should go to Mrs. Nancy Eklund of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE who compiled the initial seminar materials and shepherded the manuscript through to completion. Our thanks also go to Mrs. Virginia Patterson of WICHE for editorial assistance, Miss Valerie Heathie of the University of California for compiling the bibliography, and Mrs. Clara Roberts who assisted

with the logistical arrangements at the seminar. The staff of the Sterling Institute is also to be recognized for their fine seminar facilities and their readily accessible services. And finally, we appreciate the contribution of the ESSO Foundation toward publication of this document.

Alexander Astin ..... American Council on Education

Lyman Glenny ..... Center for Research and Development in Higher Education

Ben Lawrence ..... National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE

Robert Mautz ..... Florida State University System and State Higher Education Executive Officers

Richard Millard ..... Education Commission of the States

John Minter ..... National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE

George Weathersby .. Office of the President, University of California and Ford Research Program in University Administration

INTRODUCTION

Never before in the history of higher education has the concern over statewide planning been so widespread. With our institutions of higher education under attack, statewide planning is being regarded by many as the vehicle that can effect better institutional management and enhance public opinion of higher education. Along with this new focus for statewide planning has come the need for reassessment of the meaning of its role in higher education. Concurrent with the new role has come the necessity to reevaluate the organizational structure that would accomplish that role. One area of particular concern has been the relationship of the coordinating board to the other segments of postsecondary education responsible for providing educational services. The master plans that were developed in the '50s and '60s in some of the larger states are now being carefully reassessed. All this reassessment has come about not only by students but also by faculty, administrators, legislators, business and industry, and the general public, who want to know where postsecondary education is headed.

Against this background, statewide planners, statewide budget officers, state legislative fiscal officers, postsecondary education administrators, faculty members, students, and legislators came together in the third of a series of seminars concerned with higher education management. The seminar topic was statewide planning for postsecondary education. The papers presented in this document were prepared as background material for the seminar participants and do not necessarily reflect the opinion, either individually or collectively, of the seminar participants.

While many of the issues raised at the seminar were anticipated in the preparation of the papers, the creative interaction of concerned individuals can be expected to generate new ideas and to reorder the priorities of existing presentations of issues. With the imagination and dedication of the participants, discussion ensued that hopefully will assist those concerned with the reevaluation and conceptualization of the meaning and role of postsecondary education in the '70s. Some of the major concerns of the seminar participants and some insights to the tone of their thinking can be shared with the higher education community.

The most frequently mentioned managerial concern was how to provide an adequate opportunity for students to acquire postsecondary education and how to increase the variety of educational experience while confronted with highly constrained resources. From the perspec-

tive of statewide planners, two thrusts among the major goals of higher education were apparent: (1) equality of access, particularly for disadvantaged, minority, and other historically nonparticipant students; and (2) enrichment of the variety of educational opportunities, including vocational, technical, geographical, and other considerations.

Operationally, the concern for equality of access translates into enrollment forecasts by student level, discipline, and socioeconomic characteristics. At the statewide level, planners can begin to affect the number of students desiring to attend various postsecondary education institutions by setting appropriate student fees and encouraging organizational structures and curriculum offerings that are attractive to the target clienteles. Similarly, in allocating resources to its institutions, a state can create financial incentives for increasing diversity and encouraging more responsive admission and academic procedures. Yet just how to do these things was frequently asked, and the answers are not yet satisfactory.

On the resource management side little doubt existed that the resources available to postsecondary education relative to its needs will continue to decline. There was significant agreement that the development of defensible criteria for program review and interinstitutional program placement should be given high priority by statewide planners.

Many other concerns and issues, judged to have a slightly lower level of priority, were identified. These issues can be divided into those affecting the state as a whole and those relating primarily to postsecondary education institutions. Taking into account the total social-political-economic-physical environment of a state, postsecondary education planners should consider the various social indicators: (1) educational aspirations, (2) projected economic conditions (e.g., unemployment), (3) anticipated manpower needs (including the flexibility of an individual's training), (4) the economic development of the state, (5) research relevant to the state's social and economic needs, (6) better use of natural resources, and (7) other consumer needs (e.g., libraries, product tests).

States are also concerned with providing the training and experience requisite for good citizens in a democracy. One part of this is the education of economically viable men and women to insure that they can cope with a complex, competitive, financially oriented society. Another part of this concern is the continuing education of the citizenry to maintain the currency and marketability of their skills and to meet their needs of personal growth.

Another statewide concern is for the individuals of the state and their relationship tc the postsecondary education system. To what extent does their contact with postsecondary education increase their critical

thinking ability and creativity? To what extent does postsecondary education increase intergenerational contacts, expanding the age-specific experiences of both the young and the old? To what extent does the governmental structure increase their participation in the postsecondary education decision-making process? This last question can be expanded to: Who benefits from postsecondary education? In turn, these questions lead directly to the issues of governance, student tuition, and public benefits — questions that still have been only imperfectly answered.

Statewide planners are also interested in postsecondary education institutional characteristics. Most observers note an increasing rigidity of postsecondary education structures and academic social institutions attributable in part to licensing, accreditation, credentials, tenure, professional guilds, governmental policies, and formula-driven allocations. Such rigidity conflicts with statewide goals of increasing educational diversity and responsiveness and is one of the major causes of frustration for all involved. However, as these conditions are attacked at the state level, the result is increasing political intervention which evokes increased faculty and staff unionization and restrictive collective action. Moreover, unless the state is willing to assume full managerial control of postsecondary education, it needs to maintain institutional initiative and leadership. Finally, the state is striving to integrate the private and proprietorial education segments into its total plan. Again, there is no immediate and apparent resolution to these conflicting institutional and state incentives and pressures.

While no abbreviated list of the many concerns of the participants does them justice, we have recounted most of the major issues raised in group discussions at the conference. In addition to these comments, spokesmen for the various sectors of the education community — state executive officers, faculty, students, federal officials, and administrators of institutions or state systems legislators — presented their composite views on the major issues in statewide planning for postsecondary education.

STATE EXECUTIVE OFFICIALS concluded that the real issues in postsecondary education were who makes the decisions, how they should be made, and what kinds of information are needed to make these decisions. Decision making ought to be a joint process, they said, involving representatives from the higher education system, the governor's office, and the legislature. They agreed these decisions ought to be made with the most accurate, timely, high quality information possible.

FACULTY members agreed that planning and management must receive careful attention, since resource allocation decisions are

made in the broad political area at the state level in competition with such other societal needs as housing, welfare, highways, mental health, etc. These decisions ought to be made with very precise information, prudent planning, and cautious deliberation. The faculty representatives stressed the need for output measures to weigh effectiveness of programs as opposed to the use of input measures. We ought not to assess accountability in terms of space, the time faculty spends in the classroom, whether or not the phones are used for educational purposes, etc. Accountability factors should be developed that are acceptable to all of the higher education community, including the students, faculty, administrators, and statewide planners.

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS saw the necessity for comprehensive planning at all levels within the education community. We need to look at program priorities in terms of the whole educational process — from kindergarten through the postdoctorate level.

STATE HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD OFFICIALS came to a rapid consensus on ten major issues in planning postsecondary education: (1) financing total postsecondary education; (2) setting priorities among the levels or the segments of higher education; (3) responding to social public needs, accessibility, and accommodation; (4) accountability; (5) defining postsecondary education for planning purposes; (6) information central for planning; (7) governance and/or coordination; (8) management, that is, efficiency and productivity; (9) enlisting public support for private higher education; and (10) balancing the position between the political power structure and the institutions.

They conclude that the real issue is political balance which ". . . concerns effectuating planning and proceeding toward planning public postsecondary education activities for the future."

FEDERAL OFFICIALS saw that realistic planning can be done only at the state level. Needs of postsecondary education must be determined by the state so that the funders can determine what is federal and what is local responsibility to the funding of postsecondary education.

STUDENTS saw two major issues: (1) access to financial aid, and (2) diversity in and among postsecondary institutions. They also expressed hope that postsecondary education could begin to ameliorate the alienation and frustration spawned by our complex society by providing the young citizens with a better view of the actual, factual, workings of this country.

ADMINISTRATORS of institutions and systems viewed statewide

planning from the perspective of decision making. They concluded that the decisions rest ultimately with the legislative body; however, it is a joint process with input provided to the legislators from several groups. Machinery is needed for continuous evaluation of goals, structures, and organization as well as programs.

LEGISLATORS articulately expressed the need to plan as addressing itself to the people, about the people, and for the people. They expressed the need to plan for the future lest higher education go further and further from relevance and public support. They asked how educational decision makers see the future world. Legislators saw the role of government as one of questioning and making statements about the future goals of society. They saw that "the hidden issue is whose perceptions of individuals' needs and societal needs are going to determine planning in the future of higher education."

Interestingly, no voice among the broad categories of participants was raised against statewide planning for postsecondary education. Instead, consensus prevailed that statewide planning can be beneficial to education as long as it involves a planning system that meets the needs of all society. In particular, planning systems were thought to be needed in order to provide equal access to and diversity within the postsecondary education community. If we fail to produce planning mechanisms that adequately meet the needs of the '70s (i.e., mechanisms for measuring the benefits, assuring equal access, etc.), we may face serious confrontation between management and faculty, students and public, funders and administrators over allocation of scarce resources to the postsecondary education community.

PART I

Issues in Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education

CHAPTER 1

Issues Related to the Purposes of Postsecondary Education

Ben Lawrence*

OVERVIEW

This chapter argues that education planners must take cognizance of the changing nature of American society as a whole. The purposes of postsecondary education cannot be determined without reference to those changes and must, therefore, themselves be changing. In particular, "empire-building, self-serving goals understood only by those within the institution will no longer be acceptable."

One of the purposes of postsecondary education is generally acknowledged to be the provision of avenues to social and financial advancement. The question of access is therefore examined and with it such attendant questions as retention and remedial programs for the poorly prepared. The validity of tying enrollments to future manpower needs is questioned at length on both moral and practical grounds and a caveat issued. "The failure of planning agencies to relate the goals of institutions to the needs and characteristics of their current student bodies and their future needs is still a major factor of the 'qualitative' crisis in postsecondary education today."

The issue of the roles of research and certification in the process of postsecondary education are broached: "Certification, in fact, is probably one of the greatest causes of rigidity and inequality in education . . ." and it is argued that as postsecondary education has moved to service a massive clientele the mix of traditional functions, such as instruction, public service, and research, ought to be challenged.

Since postsecondary education bestows benefits on both its students and on society at large, the questions of who should pay for educational services and how they should be financed in general are examined in this light. With regard to federal financing, the author concludes ". . . the direction such national involvement takes may profoundly affect the planning agencies' ability to function."

*Director, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE and associate director of WICHE.

One thing is abundantly clear. Postsecondary education is changing, just as the goals of society are changing; and the purposes of postsecondary education must reflect these changing goals. Changing purposes are vitally important to planning postsecondary education. In fact, planning would not be necessary if change were not desired. Accordingly, it is important to identify and describe briefly those issues related to the purposes of postsecondary education that planning must take into consideration for the future.

In a sense, all issues in statewide planning are related to the purposes of higher education or, at least, to the interpretation of purpose as perceived by participants in the process. In this discussion we are not concerned with all of the details of issues that can be related to purpose, but with those fundamental issues that deal with the hopes and aspirations of individuals as they relate to the needs and purposes of society and the tensions produced by the stresses in that relationship.

THE INDIVIDUAL VERSUS THE STATE

The needs and aspirations of the state are not in every respect compatible with either the needs and aspirations of the individual or the sum of the needs and the aspirations of all of the individuals of the state. For the state, education is perceived to be an important component of social preservation and progress. For the individual, education is perceived to be the major avenue to social and financial advancement, and evidence supports this perception. While education is only one major component in meeting the needs and aspirations of the state, for most individuals education is the only viable hope for future advancement. Since both the individual and the state have a common (although unidentical) interest in education, the balance between the interests of the individual and the interests of the state must be carefully weighed in the process of state planning.

While concern for the individual becomes somewhat less well focused at the postsecondary education level, it would appear that here is where it is in the best interest of the state to maintain that concern. Many students are reasonably well fitted to cope with the complexities of modern life upon completion of secondary school. Many students thus prepared have been made aware of the com-

pensations associated with further educational attainment and are averse to relinquishing their rights to that opportunity. Awakening this interest in the individual and then attempting to subjugate it to the interest of the state produces disillusionment and hostility. Instead of side-stepping the issue, the response of responsible planners should be to devise means by which the interests and aspirations of the individual and the interests and aspirations of the state can reinforce each other. This is indeed a challenge as well as a grave responsibility for the state planning function.

Demand for a Faster Response to Changing Needs and Aspirations

In the past, with fewer people involved and consequently fewer competing demands, goal-setting for postsecondary education was relatively easy to accomplish through general consensus. Furthermore, goals did not change much from year to year or decade to decade. All learning was perceived to be "good" and if pursuit of truth or an idea took an extra year — or ten — there was always tomorrow. The unhurried pace of the pleasant academic world was not much concerned with national priorities, but rather with maintaining a pleasant way of life for those fortunate and capable enough to participate in it.

Then certain fields of scientific inquiry developed rapidly because of vastly improved technologies. The store of human knowledge and discovery grew almost beyond comprehension. Instant worldwide communication brought other worlds into our homes and classrooms.

Now our young people in postsecondary education are demanding that the purpose and goals of education be thoroughly examined and priorities be established for reaching them. No more are young people satisfied with goals relevant only to the past. While they may not be capable of clearly articulating the goals they perceive, they want to know what education is all about in terms of the meaning and quality of life instead of learning how to finance one's survival, security, and convenience. They expect not only a statement of purpose for today, but an indication of where a response to that purpose leads for tomorrow. Thus, goal-setting for postsecondary education necessarily involves a concern for the direction of education. It is not enough for planners to plan for meeting today's problems today or tomorrow. Lag time on delivery of services makes that approach outmoded. State planners must look

ahead, anticipating where society is going to be the day after tomorrow before starting to plan today.

If postsecondary education is to serve society in the future, its goal-setting capability must not only determine where we want to be, but it must anticipate the changing aspirations of society in order to meet its needs as well as guide its aspirations.

What kind of society is postsecondary education intended to serve? Should the institution become an active agent of social change? The current crises on the campuses revolves around issues of civil rights, the war, the environment, poverty, drugs, race, political power, and the issue of national priorities. The issue of academic freedom has been overshadowed by the issue of whether colleges and universities ought to become active agents of social change.

Self-serving goals understood only by those within the institution will no longer be acceptable. Clear statements of purpose are currently being asked for, and we may expect that they will continue to be asked for until received.

Accessibility

Since education and educational achievement are perceived to be avenues to social and financial advancement, the question of who shall be given the opportunity to benefit from educational services has long been answered on paper: everyone who is qualified and desires to pursue a course in postsecondary education should have the opportunity. In fact, however, the opportunity is not open to everyone. Postsecondary education today is like a candy store with a number of hungry kids standing in front of the window looking at the delectables inside. They are free to go in and buy as much as they wish. Trouble is, they don't have any money. The issues involved in the meaning of equal access to educational opportunity are certainly not new, but they have become more intense.

Access and Accommodation

Closely associated with the issue of accessibility of services is the issue of proximity of the services to the students. The costs of living away from home and/or the costs of commuting long distances add substantially to the costs of the student's tuition and fees. Time spent in commuting even 30 miles detracts from the

student's earning power and his studies, since time is a very valuable asset to the student.

Willingham (1970) has recently shown that because of a lack of systematic planning in the location of new colleges, especially junior colleges, the access of the low income groups to services has not optimally increased in most states. There is also a need for a wide range of new programs — work-study programs, training for business and industry, field work, much greater emphasis on creative and artistic activities, and training for social services. Palola raises questions about the definition of minimum standards for a "comprehensive curriculum," the meaning of an open door admissions policy, and the appropriateness of most types of remedial programs for students experiencing academic difficulties (Palola et al., 1970:306-09).

Observers are also commenting on the very slow progress being made in the articulation of the many new junior and community colleges with bachelor's degree granting institutions. There is still a great reluctance on the part of the four-year institutions to accept transfers from two-year institutions. While state legal provisions may assure transferability, departmental admission standards militate against transfers to universities. Without agreement among the institutions, these unresolved problems will become even more acute as the three-year bachelor's degree is introduced and as more states create colleges which begin at the junior year. A detriment to the success of effective articulation between institutions of postsecondary education is that we lack the mechanisms to help students learn how to use a "system" of institutions in their planning for education beyond high school (Tillery, 1971:55).

One feature of master plans under critical observation is the issue of providing access to institutions for undereducated students without providing programs appropriate for their retention and improvement. During the past decade much has been done for the distribution of students across complex state systems of colleges and universities, and it is within this structure that programs for the undereducated are being developed. But Tillery states that "what was a virtue a decade ago is now seen as a vice by those who seek equal educational opportunity for the poor and the racial ethnic minorities of American society." He writes:

> Evidence supports the cry that existing master plans for education beyond high school . . . are "racist" plans. Elite public and

> private colleges are skimming off the bright, white and affluent college-going youth, while junior colleges are expected to serve the great mass of students whom the senior institutions do not want. There is also false promise here as two-year colleges do not have adequate resources, faculty, or curriculum to educate the undereducated (Tillery, 1971:4).

In addition, public community colleges, which have gained the reputation of serving identical student bodies, in reality serve markedly different "mixes" of students. Thus, the use of traditional grading curves in junior institutions, which proclaim to educate the undereducated whom other institutions do not serve, is another means of pushing this group out of college (Tillery, 1971:11). Issues such as the determination of policy regarding the location and function of new institutions, the alternatives for program emphasis, and effective articulation agreements across the total state system arise in an attempt to make educational services easily accessible to the students.

Academic selectivity has generally been the basis for admission to postsecondary education. It has been considered necessary to a higher level of academic achievement and for the advancement of knowledge on which our competitive society is based. If open admission policies are generally accepted, the basis for selectivity may well be challenged.

Thus, another major feature of state master plans for post-secondary education, the use of admission standards and tuition rates to direct students into desired types of institutions and programs, is being challenged. Arguments for the planned differentiation of students and institutions have substance because a faulty distribution of students within a system will result in higher costs; but the difficulty in practice is that the proposition assumes few changes in the goals of any institution. Also, "there is a resulting fallibility in matching student to college environment which is perhaps best shown by the high mobility of students after first entering college; and, of course, by the high drop-out rates during the college years" (Tillery, 1971:6).

In most state systems, achievement measures do separate groups of students from one another; the high achievers and scorers go to the universities and the lower achievers and scorers go to the junior institutions, but:

> It comes as a surprise to some educators and legislators to learn that sorting students by traditional measures of school achieve-

> ment (grades and test scores) will also group them into student bodies which are different in other important ways — color, mix, family resources for education, intellectual and social orientations. Perhaps, then, we have jumped the gun by legislatively interfering with a vastly complex and largely blind social process — the transition of students from school to college (Tillery, 1971:5).

Already voices are being raised — Julian Bond's for example — which argue that selection ought to be based on a cross section of society in order to prevent the continuing subservience of one segment of society to another. This position holds that academic selectivity, in part, has been based on heritage and environment as well as innate ability. The demand for graduates is currently proclaimed by many as being a major determinant of who shall be admitted and for how long — particularly at the graduate level.

Master plans in most states have planned for the development of graduate, professional, research, and specialized undergraduate programs, and the organizational means for controlling their proliferation. Perhaps it is already too late to correct many of the critical errors made by planners in expanding the numbers and kinds of advanced graduate institutions and programs. Nevertheless, new, more realistic plans must be developed for their control. Appropriate cost data probably will provide the basis on which many decisions to "go slow" or retrench will rest. Only a few states avoided the error of overexpansion of certain programs which must now be corrected.

Current oversupplies in some academic disciplines and professions, notably the sciences, suggest that determination of admissions by discipline will be influenced to some extent by the current and anticipated labor supply and demand in that discipline. On the other hand, demand for medical doctors has not been alleviated by the knowledge that the demand exists, for the response to demand in this area has been tempered by the profession's determination of standards.

Predicting demand for graduates is not only difficult, but using this prediction as an indicator of what admissions policies should be is also fraught with difficulties. The Commission on Postsecondary Education in Ontario has this to say about the issue:

> Education is also often seen as an instrument of "manpower planning." The argument here rests on the assumption of a link

between the future demands of the labour market and the products of the present educational system. Yet, this linkage is also hard to verify. One difficulty with a manpower-oriented educational system is that manpower planning is notoriously unreliable. This is no fault of those responsible for such planning; rather the trouble seems to lie in the very nature of manpower planning and in the difficulty of establishing any but the most tenuous links between educational requirements and the future manpower needs. Certainly the rate of change that our society experienced since World War II would seem to indicate the unpredictable character of these changes, and there is no reason to assume that we are able to predict the occupational structure of our future society with any greater degree of success. It is generally agreed by most observers that the present generation of students will face a labour market made up of a majority of occupations that are presently unknown. Assuming, however, that we could develop better economic and manpower planning skills — and there is definitely room for improvement here — how would these manpower needs be translated into educational requirements? Basically, the problem is how to develop our educational system in such a way as to be able to provide both the immediate application of acquired knowledge and skills, and, at the same time, prepare the individual for a lifetime of changes — including occupational changes. Moreover, suppose we ever solve this problem; another would still remain: how to translate that plan into reality. Experience indicates that the students base their future plans, especially educational ones, on current market conditions. Much better vocational and educational counseling would, of course, improve the situation — and we should do all to achieve such improvements — but it would not solve the problem.

Fundamentally, therefore, the case for closer coupling of manpower and educational requirements faces political and moral objections: an effective enforcement of such coupling would lead to stricter command type economic planning and thus to much greater infringement of the individual's freedom of choice than most of us are willing to contemplate. In a sense, this aspect of education illuminates, as perhaps no other facet does, a basic dilemma of our present society. We desire to provide as much security for the individual as possible while, at the same time, refraining from encroaching upon his area of individual freedom and responsibility.

There are some specific areas in our educational system where this dilemma needs immediate attention. For example, should we allow an unlimited entry into some of our professional schools even though we already know that there is, or that there is about to be a surplus of manpower in this field — thereby expressing our faith both in the functioning of the market mechanism and in human rationality? Or should we impose limitations upon

admissions and thus "save" the individual from himself and his possible mistakes?

But, assuming we do know what the term "surplus" means (it can mean merely a professional definition in order to safeguard income for the profession as a whole), should it be the government that "saves" the individual from his own inclinations and fulfillment? These are not trivial matters and they should be decided on a matter of principle first before we embark — willy-nilly — upon a course that can lead to some undesirable but unpredictable ends. For just as often as bad means corrupt good ends, so bad can be achieved by perfectly good means (Commission on Postsecondary Education, 1970:6).

There are also other elements of the educational process which suggest further changes in the assumptions which control planning: use of new instructional techniques, involving closed-circuit TV, computer dial access systems, teaching machines, programmed textbooks; the emerging emphasis on continuing or adult education; year-round operation of campuses; the three-year degree; and the external degree.

Many data for planners have been collected and analyzed during the past decade, and some of the earlier limitations of the planning dimension of coordinating agencies are being met. But the failure of planning agencies to relate the goals of institutions to the needs and characteristics of their current student bodies and their future needs is still a major factor of the "qualitative" crisis in postsecondary education today.

There is a growing concern about the basic aims and purposes of postsecondary education. Although these concerns are voiced from different participant perspectives, they all suggest the necessity of considering alternative ways of designing new structures and processes to coordinate and plan for current and future requirements of postsecondary education. The issue is not whether such services shall be provided but in devising the most suitable methods of providing them. In many cases, the self-interest of the institution creates barriers to the dissemination of services or the establishment of new institutions. In other cases, high income groups, usually better represented in the decision-making councils, tend to control the location and scope of the educational services. The issue is whether the planning agency, even with the necessary authority, will be able to resolve the operational substantive problems involved.

THE FUNCTIONS OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Emphasis on Instruction: A Challenge to the Traditional Functions of Postsecondary Education

As postsecondary education has moved from an enterprise serving an elite minority to one serving a massive clientele, it would appear that the traditional functions (instruction, research, and public service) or at least the mix of these traditional functions should be challenged. Is research really essential to the process of education? Are research and teaching inextricably linked together? Some state legislatures are taking active steps to ensure that state dollars are used for instruction, not for research. They insist that public service must be self-supporting. President Nixon has called for "mission oriented research" — research that has a purpose in mind. Risk capital, which allows a researcher to follow a line of inquiry with no specific purpose in mind other than to find out new things, is already hard to obtain. A further emphasis on the importance of instruction and the desirability of a better life through greater technical competence is seen through the use and expansion of community colleges. Here, where instruction and life-long education are stressed, enrollments are burgeoning.

Certification

In the past, learning and certification at the postsecondary level have been entrusted to the institutions and the professions with which they are associated. The Commission on Postsecondary Education in Ontario has addressed this question very well.

> . . . there is an observable historical trend that shows how the various professions have over the years increased their educational requirements (i.e., number of years of schooling) as a pre-condition of entry into these professions. At times this increase is justified on the grounds that increased "professional quality" brings about returns in better professional services. Unfortunately, the "professional quality" is often defined and measured in terms of years spent at school.* The result is, of course, a vicious circle that permits the maintenance — or initiation — of high fees for professional services on the grounds of

*Cf. Report of the Committee of the Healing Arts: "Throughout our investigation of the educational requirements for the various health groups reported in Volume 2, the Committee has been conscious of a persistent tendency for these requirements to increase. But sometimes, too, it was difficult to avoid the suspicion that these proposals (for increased educational requirements) could be attributed to the measures of prestige and exclusiveness higher educational attainments were expected to confer upon the members of the occupation concerned."

increased number of years spent at school — and the justification of additional years of schooling on the basis of prospective high income.

Certification, in fact, is probably one of the greatest causes of rigidity and inequality in education. It is therefore imperative that we take a new look at the need for justification of certification and its coupling to education. On the one hand, certification is necessary in our society.

It would be impossible to rely upon the individual good will of those who provide services and products not to short-change or harm their customers; or to expect society to leave its citizens unprotected. Yet, what society is unwilling to leave in the hands of individual providers of services and products, it often leaves in the hands of professional organizations representing the individual practitioners — presumably on the grounds that the judgment of quality of services can be provided only by the experts — and trusts their self-imposed ethics. But it is presently possible to separate the two basic reasons for certification — projection of the consumer and the necessary professional judgment — to devise a policy that would accomplish both and to prevent any possible abuses.

Finally, as large organizations, both private and public, become more prevalent in our society, the need for classification, and thus for certification, increases. Because this particular need of mass bureaucracies in mass society has not as yet been met satisfactorily, there is a temptation to use as a proxy the most convenient available paper certification: educational "achievements." The problems facing the postsecondary education system in the area of certification then, are as follows: Should admission to professional schools in various individual disciplines be limited in accordance with the wishes of the related professional societies? Should educational requirements for entry to professions be as stringent as they are at present? Should we not strive towards greater occupational mobility by encouraging — or at least facilitating — lateral movements of students, rather than forcing them to "re-do" years of pre- and professional education that have often very little to do with the practice of the profession proper? Indeed, should educational institutions be divorced from the whole certification process?

ISSUES RELATED TO THE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT PROCESS

As postsecondary education has moved from a relatively small industry to a relatively large industry, the planning and management task has become larger and more complex. As with any social process that becomes larger and more complex, a large number of issues tend to develop. These issues vary greatly, ranging, for example, from the very detailed matter of make-up of a specific

formula for allocating resources among institutions to the more generalized issue of the use of formula budgeting systems. It is intended in this section to consider only the more general issues.

New Concepts of Accountability

Almost everyone is in agreement that the time has come for postsecondary education to make a close, critical, and careful examination of itself. While periodic self-examination has been done in the past, current social, political, and economic circumstances have brought about external pressures for colleges and universities to take stock of themselves to an extent and in a manner not heretofore experienced in American postsecondary education. At all levels and in various ways, private and public postsecondary institutions are increasingly being called upon to account for their programs, their courses of action, and the funds available to them.

While it is clear that "institutional research" and "fiduciary accounting" do not appear to meet the needs of the new accountability, what will meet those needs is not yet explicit. Many terms are being employed — management information systems; cost benefit analysis; planning, programming, and budgeting systems; etc. — but they do not explain "accountability" in the real world.

While the shape of the new concepts of accountability is not yet entirely clear, at least three aspects are apparent: intention, effectiveness, and efficiency.

Intention appears to be an important aspect in the new accountability since the shortage of resources has dictated that not all desirable things can be done, thus requiring priorities to be set. One of the current issues involved in evaluation is whether the unintended effects are to be measured. Today, the cry is very often heard: "Stop the frills and concentrate on the essentials" (Pace, 1962:2).

From the point of view of evaluation, another statement is being heard: "Do not measure the consequences of education, but measure the extent to which the stated objectives were attained" (Pace, 1962:2). Yet, it very often is an objective to obtain unintended results; individual psychic development is one example. In any event, the new accountability appears to call for a clear statement of purpose prior to the expenditure of funds as a yardstick against which to measure effectiveness.

Effectiveness refers to the degree to which the program succeeds

in doing what was intended. Effectiveness becomes a very vague concept without knowing what was intended, without understanding purpose.

Efficiency refers to the program's capacity to achieve the intended results within a given expenditure of resources. Efficiency is a measure of relative effectiveness and relative costs.

Traditionally, purpose has been vaguely defined, evaluations have been seriously concerned with measuring the consequences of higher education, and efficiency has been related to the acquisition of resources to be used in higher education. The new accountability relates all three by asking: "What are you attempting to accomplish? How will you know when you have accomplished it? How much will it cost to accomplish?" This new accountability means that planners will be required to define purposes and goals more explicitly than ever before.

It should also be noted that the new accountability does not intend to ignore the consequences of postsecondary education (particularly, the side effects on students), but rather views these as either beneficial windfalls (if they are desirable) or reasons to reevaluate goals and processes (if they are undesirable).

Financing Postsecondary Education

Financing postsecondary education is another major issue related to the planning and management process. The issue is currently joined under the topic of alternative methods of financing postsecondary education even though, realistically, the issue boils down to a consideration of who shall pay.

The question of who shall pay — and how — has many aspects, but basically it can take one of two directions. Either the students and/or parents can assume a greater proportion of the cost, or society (the public) can assume a greater proportion of the cost. These two positions illustrate the general problem even though neither is likely to be carried to an extreme.

Students are presumed to be the major beneficiaries of the educational system's outputs, and it is argued that they should pay the costs of their education. Thus, the rewards for educational achievement would then pay for the cost of attaining that education. If the students were paying the bill, there would be an identifiable consumer, and organizations of consumers would assume a legitimized role in the decision-making function, assuming a

marketing orientation. It would give both students and the institutions incentive to be realistic about the students' needs and their desires. It would place a market value on the cost of education. Students may not, however, place much value on the research and community service functions of the institutions; thus, financing primarily through students may result in the loss of those services necessary to the educational process and of ultimate importance to society.

Society also benefits by the education of its youth through their behavior as citizens and in their productive ability. If the state were to assume the full costs of education, including the income foregone by students, one of the major obstacles to equal educational opportunity would be removed. In addition, since society benefits from the provision of research and community service by the institution, these functions would be strengthened if society funded the system.

Set against the dichotomy described above the issues involved in alternative financing methods become clearer.

Student Aid or Institutional Aid

Financial assistance to the student allows him to purchase an education and to that extent provides him with significant control over the specifications of what his education shall be. The student also has costs in pursuing an education that are unrelated to the nature of his education, such as food, housing, clothing, transportation, and foregone income. Adequate student assistance enables the student to meet all these costs.

Aid to the institution allows the institution to provide the services it deems most important to its various clients at costs more in line with its priorities. For example, the institution can keep tuition low through tuition grants to some students and higher tuition for other students. It can provide research opportunities to faculty and various services to its region. It can improve its educational function by research aimed at expanding the knowledge base. In general, institutions will be responsive to students' needs and desires only to the extent that institutional support is directly related to student enrollment.

Loans versus grants. Financial loans to students have two important characteristics. First, low and lower-middle income students, according to empirical evidence, are reluctant to borrow.

Many would prefer not to attend college than to borrow because they do not understand the obligations they are assuming nor how they will repay them. They are not sure of their potential earning power after college. These loans appear to serve primarily middle and upper-middle class students who are not as reluctant to borrow. Second, the state eventually gets the loan back.

Grants have the reverse of these two characteristics. Low and lower-middle income students perceive, according to empirical evidence, even a small grant as an indication of society's confidence in their capability to succeed in college. The student then makes a greater effort to secure the additional funds required for him to attend college. Funds given as a grant are never recovered by the state.

Federal support of postsecondary education. As the costs of postsecondary education have continued to rise, both in terms of per student cost and total costs, as more students have decided to attend college, it has become evident that some form of regular financial support from the federal government must be developed. In general, there are two proposed plans. One calls for a massive student loan program with long term repayment based on income levels. The other plan referred to is for block grants to the institutions and states, together with a continuation of the current categorical grants.

The advantages of the loan program versus the block grants program may be seen by reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of having the society support postsecondary education directly through students on the one hand, or through institutions on the other.

Block grants, of course, pose another problem. Who should receive the grants from the federal government? The institutions directly or the state? Education is considered to be a responsibility of the state. To give block grants to the institutions may further erode state planning efforts and may result in further deterioration of institutional support if the states should feel that institutions were not sufficiently in their control. On the other hand, if the grants went to the states, it would increase their planning ability and control over public institutions, but would also compound the problem of private institution and state relationships. Many states have constitutions that would prohibit the state from providing such grants to private institutions, although the recent Supreme

Court ruling of Tilsit *v.* Richardson has opened more avenues for public monies to be allocated to private institutions. In addition, private institutions historically have not considered themselves confined to the state's boundaries. For them to suddenly receive support through the state as opposed to the federal government may result in having them become more like state institutions. They will probably not like losing their independent and diverse characteristics, something which is likely to happen to some degree if federal grants are channeled through the state.

The question of the alternatives for financing postsecondary education is one which will increasingly perplex the planning agency in the next several years, but it would appear that national involvement and concern will remove much of the intensity of this debate from the state level. At the same time the direction such national involvement takes may profoundly affect the planning agencies' ability to function.

Interinstitutional Resource Allocation

Related to the planning and management process is the problem of allocating resources to institutions. Techniques currently employed to develop and review budgets and to allocate resources among the institutions include:

1. Line item budgets
2. Cost analysis of various types
3. Formulas

Each of these techniques has advantages and shortcomings. To some extent each of these techniques is presently being employed. More significant than any of the shortcomings or the advantages of these techniques is the purpose to be accomplished in the budgeting process, new techniques that may be employed, and the depth of involvement of the legislative body in the budget process.

What are the purposes of the budget process? From one point of view the process is designed simply to raise money for the institution and its programs. From this perspective, budgets tend to become "asking" (Berdahl, 1971; Ch. 6-36) documents. They are designed to obtain financial support with as little constraint as possible. Fiscal flexibility is protected.

From another point of view the budget process is to provide a mechanism to bring about some objectivity in the politically

difficult task of allocating scarce resources among the institutions and to some extent among the major programs (i.e., graduate, undergraduate, research) of the institutions. Formula approaches to budget building have been particularly helpful in addressing this problem.

From another perspective the budget process is to develop a financial plan for operating the institution on "spending" (Berdahl, 1971: Ch. 6-36) budgets. The financial plan is to stipulate what is to be done, how much it will cost, to some extent in what manner it will be done, and when the planned activity can be certified, in fact, as having been done. For the most part lip service only has been given to this view of budgeting. However, planning, programming, and budgeting systems (PPBS) now being seriously developed purport to be responding to this need. There are, however, two reservations that need to be made in this regard. First, PPBS has yet to be applied successfully to a postsecondary institution. While serious efforts at implementation are underway and some states (California and Hawaii) have legislatively required PPBS adoption by its institutions, it will be some time before the proclaimed advantages will be verified. A major obstacle to the success of the PPBS approach is the definition and measurement of output units. (For a complete discussion see: Farmer, 1970; Lawrence, et al., 1970; Huff, 1971.) Second, PPBS requires that programs be identified at specified levels; i.e., large aggregate packages, such as lower division instruction of 6,000 freshmen and sophomores, or small packages, such as an undergraduate mathematics program designed to provide instruction to 200 potential math majors.

Programs may be looked upon in a sense as a policy commitment to an objective. Prior budgeting techniques seldom permitted the examination of small program packages; and it was, therefore, difficult, though desirable, for legislators to become involved in such decisions. These decisions were generally left to the internal mechanisms of the institutions. If appropriately developed, PPBS will allow opportunity for the examination of relatively small program packages. The question will undoubtedly arise, "Should legislators become involved in decisions about these smaller program packages or should their concerns be confined to the larger packages?" New trends in accountability suggest that legislators, indeed,

feel that they want to be involved in the decisions concerning the smaller program packages.

Application of New Planning and Management Techniques

The development and application of new planning and management concepts to the actual planning and managing of postsecondary education are currently receiving strong support. No one seems opposed to better management, but many express reservations with application of the economic models of decision analysis, PPBS, and cost benefit analysis to such a human-oriented enterprise as education. While it is too early to determine the specifics of the issues that may arise, it is probable that issues will be joined whenever such analytical methodologies constrain the institution, and human objectives have not been and perhaps cannot be well defined.

The issues facing the planning agency in the next several years are indeed many and complex. They are perhaps more complex in the area of postsecondary education than in any other area due to widespread human involvement and public attention. Planners, by definition, attempt to structure things in order to make them clear and explicit to all parties concerned. Planners, particularly in the future, must find a means of accounting for human needs and aspirations which are neither clear nor explicit and, perhaps, by definition ought not to be.

CHAPTER 2

Current Statewide Planning Structures and Powers

Lyman Glenny* and Julie Hurst†

OVERVIEW

Chapter 2 traces the development of statewide planning agencies, their powers, and their responsibilities through the period of the '50s and '60s. Of primary interest are the single board structure and the coordinating board. The older and more persistent single board structure, although more strongly opposed by institutional officers, is currently gaining favor among political leaders because of the growing attitude that higher education must be held more accountable to the public. When one looks at the traditional roles that such boards have played, this preference becomes more understandable.

It is noted that in the beginning "... coordinating and governing agencies considered budgeting as the only essential function..." and that "... legislators looked to the statewide board to limit spending with equity among the institutions." Theoretically, the single superboard ought to have less difficulty in compelling implementation of budgetary policy, although in practice this has yet to be observed.

Program review and master planning are newer extensions of the powers of statewide boards or agencies. Unfortunately, only a few agencies have been successful in promoting a diversity of new types of institutions, and there has been a notable lack of success in the attempt to reallocate existing programs and functions among competing institutions or to discontinue programs which have proved to be unsuccessful. The reasons for these failures are examined and nearly uniformly point to the unwillingness of

*Associate Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, and professor of economics, University of California at Berkeley.

†Research educator, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley.

institutions to relinquish long-standing prerogatives to agencies with inadequate authority to force the issues. The problems are compounded by the difficulty of measuring the inputs and outputs of higher educational systems so that the need for definition and redefinition of quantitative and qualitative goals continues to be unsatisfied.

In examining the effects of statewide planning on institutional autonomy, the disparity between the views of the institutional officers who feel threatened by the increasing authority of central agencies and " . . . the generally positive conclusions supporting the role of the coordinating agency as protector of institutional autonomy and the public interest" is noted. Certainly a major role which coordinating agencies are currently playing is that of a buffer between the institutions and well-staffed state budget offices, which are increasingly able to utilize management information systems and program budgeting to make decisions which were once the province of the institutions themselves.

This chapter delineates the trends in the formation of state agencies of planning and coordination; changes in their patterns and structure; and shifts in their powers, composition, and *modus operandi*. The purpose is to focus on practices and trends and to point out the gaps and weaknesses from which issues evolve.

For a decade the development and the process of coordination for institutions and/or systems of public postsecondary education in a great number of states have been well discussed in the literature on coordination and statewide planning. From 1959 to the present the trend toward the solution of problems has been moving slowly but surely in the direction of centralizing structures and powers and making policy decisions at higher levels at the same time that the problems and their solutions have become more complex and difficult to solve.

The milieu in which this process developed and is still taking shape is fraught with the unresolved issues and problems of the degree to which postsecondary education is a matter of right rather than privilege for all young people regardless of academic ability or economic means. The diverse rhetorical goals set by the federal government emphasizing the manpower function of higher education, heavily supporting graduate and professional education, assist-

ing veterans of American wars in obtaining postsecondary education, setting the goals for "free and universal access to education, in terms of the interests, ability, and need of the student" (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947:36-37), and committing resources to equal opportunity have changed the traditional orientation of higher education.

But the states, sometimes working within the federal context and sometimes at cross purposes with it, were the chief financial supporters of the new education. Increasing demands for postsecondary education and ever-increasing enrollments led them to include in postsecondary education provision for public service, research, vocational-technical education, and lifelong learning, as well as the diversity of institutions which offered these programs. The issues arising from accommodating the interests of more and more students in different types of institutional environments might have been more clearly resolved if state planning had been clearer in its goals and more effective in pursuing them.

A variety of state efforts were made to meld the new with the already established traditions and patterns of public and private higher education and, at the same time, to be responsive to the characteristics and attitudes of the residents within the state. These attempts at achieving unity of purpose led to new mechanisms for coordinating and planning a system of postsecondary education.

From the view of the state, coordination meant more effective use of appropriations; from the view of state colleges, coordination meant a fairer share of appropriations; and from the view of state universities, it meant restricting the state colleges from any encroachment on their university research and graduate programs. However, in spite of the advantages and safeguards a central agency could offer, educators, fearing that coordination would standardize operations and produce educational mediocrity, generally opposed the establishment of legal and even voluntary coordinating machinery. These fears and a lack of unity of purpose have persisted and, in some states, have grown to rather alarming proportions, ironically becoming the immediate catalysts for further centralization. However, when the chips were down, the state's need to economize and eliminate wasteful duplication of efforts, to establish a rationale for developing new institutions and campuses, and to do so on "realistic budgets" took priority over institutional desires.

Thus, the forming of structures to cope with and to give direc-

tion to the interests, goals, and aspirations of diverse publics and institutions continues to accelerate, despite the lack of unity and purpose or, perhaps, because of that lack.

TYPES OF AGENCIES

Despite the singular characteristics of each state's traditional educational system, three types of coordinating structures emerged and have been in a constant state of flux or refinement for the past fifteen years.

Voluntary agencies, often formed but short lived, were composed of institutional officers, in theory allowing for maximum institutional freedom while providing the minimum coordination essential for obtaining state funds. At first, they were almost exclusively concerned with budget preparations and dividing the legislative appropriations, but gradually they have become concerned with program allocation and planning.

The overall effectiveness of voluntary agencies can be seen in their record of instability and their poor record of accomplishment. Of the many states attempting voluntary coordination only two remain in this category. These agencies failed because of the "competitive propensities of major institutions," the "imitative tendencies of 'lesser' institutions" (McConnell, 1964), and the inability to stress positive goals of "*productive* compromise between the values of autonomy and coordination" (McConnell, 1962).

All of these states replaced their voluntary agencies with statutory agencies of the coordinating board type, and after California made a shift to a majority of public members in 1971, there remained only one agency of this group with a majority of institutional members. Not only is the trend toward further centralization, but toward better representation of the public interest.

Single Board

The oldest and most persistent type of coordinating system is the single board for governing all the public institutions in a state. (A few states have separate community college systems.) It is assumed that the reader is familiar with the normal processes and functions of institutional governing boards, hence such details are omitted here as well as the characteristics of their operation. No state with a single board mechanism has changed to the coordinating board organization, but there appears to be a slight trend away

from the latter structure toward the single board. From 1945 until the late '60s the number of statewide governing boards remained static. In 1968 and 1969, Maine and West Virginia went from no coordinating agency to adopting a consolidated governing board, and in 1969 Utah changed from a coordinating board with a majority of public members to a consolidated governing board. The total of consolidated governing boards is now 19. There are rumors that other states are preparing to follow suit.

The popularity of the coordinating board over the single board is attributed to the ease with which such boards can be established legally. To create a single governing board requires the abolition of all those in existence and coming to some political agreement of the new board. This process is fraught with trauma and pits strong political forces in polar positions. Institutional officers have been opposed more strongly to the "One Big Board" concept than to the coordinating board. However, the growing attitude that higher education must be made more accountable has attracted the political leaders toward a simple solution — one board rather than many.

The advantages attributed to the single board are that it is legally capable of effectively coordinating and unifying the system, has strong powers to compel implementation of planning policy, and does not have to share authority with other boards. In practice, researchers on planning and coordination have found that the single board is no more effective in coordination, conserving resources, controlling programs, or in other operations than is the coordinating board. Moreover, it has proven less capable of developing and effecting long-range master planning policies than coordinating boards.

Unfortunately, perhaps new confidence in the single board concept has not been preceded by an analysis of the possible consequences, especially the possibility that most of these newly centralized powers may eventually be transferred with ease to the state executive budget offices.

Coordinating Boards

The creation of statewide coordinating boards, or agencies, which provides for coordination by a superboard and allows for governing boards to continue to operate over individual institutions or groups of institutions in subsystems, has been the post-World

War II means of coordination. In contrast to governing boards, coordinating agencies are popular because it is relatively easy to establish them by statute, and they are more readily accepted by institutions on the assumption that they allow more initiative and more autonomy than a governing system. However, the success of a coordinating agency, situated in the middle between the institutions and the state, depends on many complex factors, the balancing of which is difficult in most states.

The advent of the coordinating board into higher educational systems has resulted in many changes and adjustments of structures in an attempt to meet the changing needs of the individual states and their institutions. Moreover, coordinating may mean one thing when an agency first attempts to bring order among the state institutions and a different thing when a system has been established. Its objectives, relationships, and methods may change, even though no alterations occur in the statutes, or conditions may change because of waning enthusiasm or developing conflicts, both internal and external. The most frequent change in organization has led in the direction of better representation of the public interest.

COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCIES

Membership

By 1965 two major subtypes of the coordinating board were emerging. Not only were a number of states creating various forms of statutory coordinating agencies, but boards composed wholly of public members or a majority of them were gaining ascendency over the number of boards composed of a majority of institutional representatives. Of the 27 coordinating boards now in existence, 26 have public member majorities and of these 26, 12 have all public members.

The most significant advantages to having a majority of public members are that the statewide view of higher educational problems and needs is maintained and there are fewer deadlocks and less logrolling in the decision-making process. Lay representation from the institutional governing boards is also desirable in order to provide first-hand inputs, to assure that all boards are part of the system rather than just "under" a superboard, and to maintain sensitivity to academic problems. Minority representation on a board or else strong academic advisory committees is seen as an

adequate means of getting the institutional point of view to the coordinating board.

Powers

Associated with the above trend in composition of the board is the trend toward increasing the number and strength of board powers. Three major subtypes of coordinating boards reveal something about their powers: (1) boards with advisory powers composed of at least a majority of institutional members; (2) boards with advisory powers composed of at least a majority of public members; and (3) boards with regulatory powers (but no authority to govern institutions), all of which have a majority of public members. The trend has been to grant more regulatory powers to those coordinating boards which are primarily composed of public members; 14 of the 27 coordinating boards now in existence have essential regulatory powers.

Coordinating agencies, both advisory and regulatory, engage in a wide range of activities. Public member agencies usually have outright authority to approve or disapprove all new programs and new campuses; to review operating and capital budgets; to set certain admission standards, tuition, and fees; and full responsibility to develop a master plan. Coordinating agencies composed of institutional representatives may be authorized to develop and implement a master plan, but because of their composition and their limitation to advisory powers, the effective fulfillment of such plans has remained a "remote possibility."

The membership, composition, and powers granted to a coordinating agency are related to the type or mode of coordination the agency may exercise and its relationships with institutions within the system and agencies of state government. There are many examples of agencies not exercising their legal powers or of agencies exercising unauthorized powers in circuitous ways. Specific examples illustrating the exercise of *de facto* and *de jure* powers can be found in a wide number of case studies. The amount and range of power to be given coordinating boards remains a matter of controversy in most states, but we do know that state governments are reluctant to give significant powers to boards composed primarily of institutional representatives and, instead, delegate increasing powers to boards composed of at least a majority of public members. The scholars on the subject of coordination and

planning indicate that to be effective a coordinating board must have powers to acquire institutional data, develop master plans, approve all programs of instruction and new campuses, and review budgets in some detail.

Another trend which has created conditions necessitating more authoritative coordination and regulation arose from the great growth of state colleges and community colleges which enroll a majority of students in higher education and, thus, command an increased audience in the legislature. The matter of jurisdiction then becomes important. Berdahl (1971:Ch. 2) has summarized the present status of the range of agency authority:

> Of the 48 existing agencies, 41 have jurisdiction over all or nearly all public higher education. In seven states — one with a coordinating board (North Carolina) and six with governing boards (Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Oregon) — the junior colleges are coordinated separately; and where post-high school vocational-technical education is handled outside the junior colleges or university branch campuses, it is usually not under agency jurisdiction. In six states — three with coordinating boards (Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania) and three with governing boards (Idaho, Montana, and Rhode Island) — the State Board of Education has been designated as the coordinating agency, and its jurisdiction encompasses not only higher education but also the public school system.
>
> . . . more agencies are attempting to incorporate the private sector of higher education in their planning efforts. But as a matter of law, only the State Board of Regents in New York has jurisdiction over the private sector with respect to program approval. In Connecticut, Minnesota, and Missouri, the coordinating boards are empowered by law to request information from private institutions and to make planning recommendations which include the private sector. . . . Federal programs administered by state coordinating agencies are willy-nilly bringing those institutions in the private sector which participate in such programs under agency jurisdiction in those limited areas.

Professional Staff of Statewide Coordinating and Governing Boards

The effectiveness of the various types of coordinating and planning agencies depends upon the structure of the board, its powers and jurisdiction, the mode of leadership the board chooses to exercise, and, most importantly, on the quality of its professional staff. The lack of an objective, independent professional staff has been a traditional weakness of voluntary agencies and also single boards. The staff must be independent of the institutions involved

as well as of state administrative agencies. The new trend for all agencies is that staff are larger in size, more professional, and better skilled in research techniques. The most important factor in setting up a strong independent staff is the appointment of a chief executive officer. A rundown of the executive's duties illustrates his importance:

> In his relationships with the agency, he acts as secretary, as staff director, and as chief initiator of policy recommendations. . . . He is the official contact for the agency with all persons in and out of the system.
>
> As the initiator of recommendations, he can wield more power and exert more influence on policy than any other person in the system.
>
> . . . He not only enforces agency decisions but also interprets their intent and scope and supplements policy with necessary administrative directives . . . (Glenny, 1959:51-52).

The findings of Berdahl's survey showed many states in the throes of finding or replacing an executive officer.

One point heavily emphasized by researchers is that a strong staff with a weak board may lead to inappropriate problems for study, use of the heavy hand in influencing agency decisions, and ignoring or not taking the time to involve academic and citizen advisory councils or committees to insure that a diversity of points of view is included in plans, reports, and recommendations.

Planning

Planning has become the central concern of formal coordinating agencies and increasingly of statewide governing boards. It is viewed as the principal process by which critical decisions are made about future ends and means in postsecondary education.

About two-thirds of the existing coordinating agencies have made or are in the process of making a master plan, while about one-half of the consolidated governing boards have done so. Thus, long-range master planning is becoming an important factor in the development of postsecondary education at the state level, but it is by no means a universal tool.

During the early period of coordination, most enabling legislation for coordinating and governing agencies did not mention planning as a function. All newly created agencies in the 1960s tended to place planning in the highest priority, as does the language of a current bill to create a formal coordinating board

in Indiana. Although the language is now there, few statewide plans contain the criteria for excellence and substance in post-secondary education requisite to achieving the goals of extending opportunity, while improving the quality and diversity of programs. Although lacking definitive criteria for achieving or assessing stated goals, budget and program review have become the primary means of implementing master plans.

Lawrence has suggested additional means of evaluating the achievement of statewide planning goals through use of cost benefit analyses and other systematic methods, but the measures themselves become new points of issue between the institutions and the state agency.

Of the deficiencies that occur in planning, one of great importance is the lack of assignment of responsibility to an explicit agency for the implementation of the plan and the lack of continuing supervision and readjustment of the means for achieving goals. It is more often in the implementation phase of planning that failure occurs than in any other. The evidence indicates that for change to occur some agency must exercise considerable power.

Because of an early dearth of data (on class size, student-faculty ratios, faculty quality, faculty loads, cost of instruction, campus size, the number of campuses), a trend developed in planning for postsecondary education which concentrated on providing the data bases necessary for planners. These quantitative elements diverted attention from the thorough examination of basic issues of educational policy and of policy assumptions. However, as soon as the quantitative methods and measures for projecting and planning for future needs of postsecondary education seem to be reaching their mark, the projected changes foreseen in substantive areas of postsecondary education will make it necessary to continue the concern with quantitative units of measure and the technical means for assessing achievement rather than focusing exclusively on types and quality of educational programs. Therefore, the dual dilemma continues and the need for definition of goals, both quantitative and qualitative, at all levels with the coordinated system continues to be an imperative.

The process of planning in many states is still limited in scope and preoccupied with fact-finding and would not qualify as master planning as defined by researchers today:

> . . . the variety of subjects studied; the volume of data collected; the depth of analyses; the integration of programs, budgets, and building priorities to provide a unity of purpose; the full inclusion of the non-public institutions; and the means for step-by-step implementation of the plan, with simultaneous review and revision leading to fulfillment of major goals (Glenny, 1965).
>
> . . . to provide expanded educational opportunities for a large number of students; to allocate resources among component institutions in a system so as to achieve maximum efficiency and economy in the use of public funds; and to do both in such a way as to assure a rich, rigorous, and relevant educational experience (Livesey and Palola, 1969).

Perhaps the most significant trend in relation to planning reflects the change in the means by which planning is conducted. Less and less, the central staffs of the state agencies, with the help of a few consultants, generate the ideas, attitudes, goals, and the means for achieving them which comprise the plan. More and more, the central staffs provide the data bases and information systems which become the factual elements used by a broad range of technical task forces and advisory committees charged with initiating recommendations to solve the diverse higher education problems. Such groups are composed of experts on the particular subject under consideration — faculty and administrators from public and nonpublic colleges and universities and leading citizen and special-interest representatives. The central staff composing the final recommendations to go before the statewide board may then draw heavily on the planning documents prepared by these groups. Additionally, public hearings are often held on a preliminary draft of a plan before the board takes final action. As a result, both new ideas and broad consensus for the plan are developed, allowing the legislature and governor to avoid much (it is never *all*) of the acrimonious contention which arises out of major changes in goals and means for their fulfillment. The plan becomes more acceptable to these political leaders and eases passage of those elements requiring legislation or new funding.

Perhaps the greatest deficiency in the planning effort is provision for means and criteria to evaluate planning effectiveness over a period of time. Although the coordinating agency is responsible for continuous planning and reevaluation as well as implementation of plans toward desired goals, the agencies have not systematically evaluated the successes and failures or the advantages and disadvantages of the new arrangements. This weakness cannot

be corrected until plans reveal more clearly than in the past the operational goals and the assumptions on which the plan is based, thereby providing a basis for evaluation.

Budget Review

During the early period of coordinating postsecondary education, coordinating and governing agencies considered budgeting as the only essential function, often neglecting other functions. State governments and institutional officers shared this attitude. Now budgeting is often considered as a means toward achieving planning objectives rather than an end in itself.

The outcome of the early dedication added a measure of sophistication to the formulating of budgets at the statewide level and encouraged institutions in the state system to develop more desirable data gathering, reporting, and management practices. However, the development of the budget review process in many states has not been without frustration. Legislators looked to the statewide board to limit spending with equity among the institutions, while the presidents of institutions thought the board successful only if it sought the total funds which they requested. An important goal of the board was to proceed with utmost objectivity in order to gain the confidence of both parties. Although never satisfying either group completely, progress was made toward developing criteria which reflected the type of institution, the disciplinary area, and the level of program. Thus, the statewide agency presented a more objective analysis of budgetary requirements of all institutions by improving their budgeting methods and reducing the subjective elements. Institutional leaders felt more equitably treated while legislators and state budget officials were better assured of how and what was being budgeted.

During the decade of the '60s, the trend toward refining budgeting procedures continued. State studies of unit costs, building capacity and utilization, and widespread use of more and more complex formulas and subformulas served to justify the great increases in operating and capital budgets to governors and state legislators. Toward the end of the decade, as costs mounted, statutes in some states required that boards set up uniform accounting practices and total statewide information and data systems. The purpose was to improve management practices and to effect optimal

use of those resources made available within the parameters of master plans.

However, while attempting to perfect the budget data base and to standardize processes, certain disadvantages also appeared.

> . . . disadvantages may also attach to the highly objective basis for budgeting, especially where . . . it is so rigidly applied that institutions are prevented from attempting innovations, conducting pilot programs, and carrying on research.
> . . . subjectivity, not objectivity, has brought some of the greatest gains to higher education . . . "free money," unencumbered by state regulation or central control and most easily made available under more subjective budget formulations, has been responsible in no small degree for the outstanding buildings, libraries, laboratories and the superior instructional programs and experimentation of many institutions (Glenny, 1959:147).

Questions were also raised as to whether there is complete objectivity in formulas as policy judgments have to be made at some time in the process.

> . . . formulas . . . contain hidden subjectivity and arbitrariness. Value judgments such as the "right" class size, the "right" teaching load, and the "right" per-unit cost are implicit in all formulas (Glenny, 1959:144).

The issue of objectivity and subjectivity in the budget review process has not really been resolved in theory, but with unit costing, management by objective, and program budgeting on the horizon, practice may get ahead of theory over the issue.

Nevertheless, the adoption of program planning and budgeting systems (PPBS) and its organization in terms of "end products" is being challenged. The authors who stated that "systems rely on quantifiable, known considerations such as number of students and faculty, student-faculty ratios, class size, and workload and, thus, impose the present on the future" (Livesey and Palola, 1969) were expressing a concern of other scholars. Moreover, those impositions on the future may be in the form of the units of measure which are adapted on a national basis while "the substances to which the units of measure apply are themselves disappearing" (Glenny, 1969b).

The "year abroad," individualization of majors, work experiences for education, external degrees, and other innovations may be in for trouble in budgeting if some method of measuring besides the course, credit hour, or class hour is not soon developed.

The implications of these trends are of serious consequence to institutions and, in many cases, to statewide agencies as the locus of decision-making can be shifted to even higher levels in the governing structure. The recipients of new powers as a result of management information systems and program planning budget systems (MIS and PPBS) will be state executive budget officers and legislative fiscal officers who may be much less concerned about the "objective-subjective" and "quantitative-qualitative" elements in the budget process.

Program Review

The goals of the program review process are closely related to the budget review process but, in the broadest sense, refer to decisions relating to the substantive development of postsecondary education. It was first thought that desired program control could be achieved through the exercise of the coordinating agency's budget review powers. The classic example is the Board of Education Finance in New Mexico which influenced and controlled programs and their allocation with budgetary powers.

The striking changes which recently occurred in the budget review process are equaled by changes in the program review process. With the new emphasis on master plans, the program review function is considered the important power in their implementation and orderly development. Common and essential program functions are to prevent unnecessary duplication of program and function in existing institutions; to encourage appropriate programs for many kinds of students in a diversity of colleges; and to provide order and control in the development of new campuses, schools, and departments.

In facing the necessity of establishing new institutions and the expansion of new campuses during the 1960s the statewide planners were responsible for assuring the state that the right type of institution was located in the proper geographic area, thus extending educational opportunities to a greater and more diverse student population. Such decisions of location are complicated by two factors perplexing to coordinating bodies since their inception: the first is the desire of state government leaders to add political criteria to location decisions, and the second is the inability of educators to divorce themselves from existing institutional self-interests in support of any new institutions. In practice only a few agencies

(Illinois, Florida, New York) have been successful in promoting the diversity of new types of institutions. Many states did increase the number of community colleges rather dramatically but most success was limited to increasing the number of existent types of institutions.

Coordinating agencies, with varying degrees of success, approve and allocate new functions and programs. Using master plan priorities and goals as guidelines, Berdahl reported that 11 coordinating boards now have the authority to approve new programs, and 13 others and the Indiana voluntary agency have the authority to recommend approval. And, as in the process of establishing new institutions, several factors have also impeded effective coordination of new functions and programs. Conflicts arise when institutions are unwilling to see a coveted program assigned to another institution; when the private sector, wishing to preserve its relative position, lobbies to prevent competitive new programs; or when duplication has existed for a long time and no institution wishes to retrench its program. Also, when coordinating board rules do not specify the exact coverage intended when requiring a review of "new programs," additional ambiguity and uncertainty heighten tensions. Finally, in many cases agencies fail to estimate adequately the costs of new programs (especially graduate), thus jeopardizing or impairing the quality of the total program.

Still another failure in the process of program review is that coordinating agencies have been particularly unsuccessful in their attempts to reallocate existing programs and functions and in discontinuing programs. In most cases agencies are not specifically authorized to do so, but even when they are charged with the task, results are few. This has been true regardless of what the state master plan has prescribed.

Besides the many factors impeding the processes mentioned previously, other elements hinder attempts to eliminate programs. Coordinating type boards find themselves tangling with governing boards which resist abolishment of any program.

The pressures and counterpressures associated with the function of program review have in no way abated, nor have agencies, even with regulatory or advisory powers, made much progress in formulating procedures or developing criteria which lend objectivity to the process.

> The power to reallocate and eliminate programs is seldom exercised because past experience has shown that such moves have unfortunate political repercussions, stirring up controversy and even leading to the agency's decision being overturned. . . . Powers to reallocate are little used during periods of rapid expansion, but should a severe recession or depression occur, this function of coordination might well become central (Berdahl, 1971:Ch. 7).

The current period of recession is already causing more activity in this area, especially by the institutions themselves, as budgets are circumscribed, and new program demands seem imperative. Planning agencies will have additional data (and ammunition) to bring down low-productivity, high-cost programs, as unit costs and management systems are applied at state levels.

Establishing the roles and functions of institutions and maintaining these "differential functions" over time is one of the most difficult tasks for state planners, and not many states have a record of success. Decisions in this area involve a determination of an institution's basic type and the general spread and level of its programs. Automatically, conflicts arise when an institution feels that external forces are prohibiting its right to fulfill its destiny.

Berdahl found that the types of coordinating agency and the approach used in making role and scope assignments are uncorrelated, and the states with coordinating boards present the most varied patterns. The range is from using operational constraints while leaving the future open (Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin) to having explicit state laws for the differentiation of functions (California, Kentucky, North Carolina).

Whether a flexible or rigid approach is more effective for role and scope assignments is still to be determined. However, the Illinois Master Plan explicitly rejected the California pattern for its ". . . tendency toward inflexibility and rigidity and a resulting waste of educational resources" (Berdahl, 1971; Palola et al., 1970).

In states where coordinating agencies now lack the authority to allocate role and scope assignments, evolving master plans indicate that the agencies will have something to say about role and scope missions in the future. Issues relating to this subject are already intensifying as enrollment projections are reduced rather than expanded for the future, as costs continue to rise, and as graduate education continues to produce surplus manpower.

An overall assessment of the program review function is that it has been moderately successful in controlling new program expansion and in setting diverse functions among institutions. Agencies have been far less successful in eliminating existing programs or in maintaining differential functions. As the future can be perceived today, there will be need for an even more diverse pattern of institutions and programs than we have produced to date.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND STATEWIDE PLANNING

From post-World War II to the early '60s, federal programs for higher education increased in number. They were directed mainly toward individual institutions, faculty members, or students in the form of National Science Foundation grants, the G.I. Bill, and National Defense Education Act scholarships and loans. During the '60s, however, several landmark bills were passed by Congress (Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the State Technical Services Act of 1965) which required the governor of the state to designate an agency to prepare a state plan and to administer the program. The HEFA of 1963 also provided some funds for state agency administrative costs and for planning. Lanier Cox (1969) reports that 20 of the 46 states with statewide coordinating or governing agencies have been named to administer federal programs concerned with undergraduate facilities and with educational equipment; 16 agencies administer community service programs; 5 agencies administer technical service programs; and only 2 agencies (Ohio and Texas) administer all four federal programs. In all other cases one or more of these programs is administered by a separate commission established expressly for that purpose.

Three major consequences for statewide planning derive from the federal legislation.

1. Federal law required that the agency chosen to administer federal programs must be representative of all institutions within the state, public and nonpublic. This feature along with the requirement that a state plan be prepared provides means for drawing private institutions more closely into statewide planning efforts. Once involved in these planning activities, the nonpublics also cooperate more freely and with greater

confidence of being treated fairly in other statewide planning activities.

2. The federal money made available to the state agencies on a formula basis for administration and planning breathed new life into some of the financially weaker statewide boards. These staffs and boards broadened their perspectives on planning, hired new experts, and began the process of involving the institutions directly in planning activities.
3. The acts focused attention on some critical areas which had not usually received sufficient attention from the state agency. This was especially true of the facilities grants and those for continuing education.

Several problems also arose from these and other federal acts which have long-range inimical consequences.

1. The states having the most sophistication in planning normally assigned administration of the acts to the existing statewide coordinating board. The states weakest in planning were the ones where the governors created one or more new agencies for their administration. These agencies and their "state plans" required by federal law were not coordinated with other statewide higher education, resulting in a confusion of goals and overlapping activity. A few of these states, realizing the need for unified planning and more effective coordination, have either abolished some of the new commissions and assigned the activities to the statewide agency or have placed the commission under control of the agency. The problem, however, still confronts the majority of states. So far the federal government has not insisted that all of its higher education programs be administered by a single state agency, although that possibility has been discussed.
2. A second problem area grows out of the tremendous influence which a federal aid program has on development of institutions in a state system. McConnell (1966) wrote:

> It will also influence the roles which particular institutions may be expected to play in a state-wide system, or in a region, the quality of education throughout the system; the development of graduate, professional and post-doctoral educational programs; the access of students to different institutions and different levels of education; and the mobility of students within the system, as well as among states; greater

centralization of authority at both state and federal levels; and a host of other consequences.

3. Because of the success of some federal programs we now have the nonpublic college segment in most states with surplus academic (and often dormitory) space. They are overbuilt.
4. We find more institutions than needed (or desirable) offering doctoral work. We also find a surplus of holders of most advanced degrees.

State coordinating and governing boards have (with few exceptions) fallen victim to federal pressures and financial inducements when the best interests of the state would have dictated a different course of public policy. The states are now being implored to aid nonpublic institutions and to continue to support or even increase their share of graduate education funding because the federal government has reduced or eliminated its financial commitments to the programs.

The future of the form and effects of federal funding of higher education are unknown. As Berdahl (1971:Ch. 11) states:

> The certainty of increased federal programs in higher education is matched only by the uncertainty of how they will be channeled: to the student as grant or loan; to the faculty member for research; to the institution as block grant or categorical aid; to the state as general grant or earmarked for certain purposes; or (most likely) some combination of these.

Whatever the developments in federal aid, state planners must be far more astute and critical in coordinating and incorporating federal efforts into those of the state.

EFFECTS OF STATEWIDE COORDINATION ON INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY

The subject of institutional autonomy and the preservation of academic freedom has been an emotionally laden topic for at least the past decade. The controversy centers on the increase of powers of coordinating boards and their effects on the autonomy of individual institutions and/or subsystems of institutions in a coordinated statewide system.

One of the greatest single problems of coordination is how to achieve the objectives of economy, efficiency, and reduction of competition among institutions for state funds without impairing

the initiative, flexibility, and diversity of public institutions. There is no doubt at all that many public institutions exercise their autonomy within boundaries set by state plans and by coordinating agency policy. The subordination of colleges and universities to a coordinating board is an impairment of institutional autonomy. However, the principal scholars on coordination state that these impairments must be viewed in comparison to the autonomy which actually existed before coordination or could exist in the future, given legislative and gubernatorial controls and the often rapacious competition for funds and programs among the state institutions. The conclusions of several case studies conducted in the recent past have supported the role of the coordinating agency as a safeguard to institutional autonomy rather than a cause for its loss.

In a study of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee, Paltridge (1966:102) concluded that "the authority structure inherent in a scheme of statutory coordination can serve as a protector rather than an adversary of the substantive autonomy of institutions."

One of the concerns of the Medsker-Clark study relating to the establishment of a governing board at the state level for California junior colleges was the ". . . effect that greater concentration of efforts at the state level would have on the institutional autonomy at the local level." They concluded that junior colleges in California would be better off ". . . as a result of the higher authority which strengthens their hands and provides alternatives to the vagaries and importunities of local pressures (Medsker and Clark, 1966: 57).

As a result of four case studies (California, Florida, Illinois, New York), Palola concluded that "agencies have served a vital function in helping to define and promote a more balanced and orderly pattern of growth, while continuing to promote educational autonomy of institutions" (Palola et al., 1970:542).

Both Berdahl and Glenny recognize the limits placed on institutions by coordinating boards that argue that the choice of institutions is not between coordination and no coordination but, rather, between effective coordination by an agency which stands in the no man's land between the institutions and the state government and the ingestion of coordinative powers into the executive branch of the government.

State budget offices are increasingly well staffed with higher paid professionals who see a need to coordinate all functions of

state government. As management information systems and program budgeting gain acceptance, these budget staffs will have the capacity to make decisions that were once the province of institutions and later of coordinating boards. It is these incursions into educational policy that really threaten autonomy of institutions.

The central higher education planning agencies have generally proceeded with a fairly high degree of ". . . sensitivity and sympathetic understanding of those conditions essential to a vigorous educational system" (Glenny, 1970b). However, institutional concerns have not abated in spite of the generally positive conclusions supporting the role of the coordinating agency as protector of institutional autonomy and the public interest. It may be well that they have not, for new tensions will be created by the continued development of coordinating agencies with stresses resultant from further fiscal economies and the vigor with which state budget offices exercise their powers. Autonomy takes on new significance as institutions are confronted by new forces.

Events which took place in the '60s will no doubt have lasting effects on the structure of postsecondary education and on the autonomy of institutions. But the trends taking place in the '70s portend even greater consequences.

CHAPTER 3

Future Challenges and Trends in Postsecondary Education

JB Lon Hefferlin*

OVERVIEW

The challenge to educational planners as expressed in Chapter 3 stems from the recognition that " . . . educational programs, policies, and enrollments are only part of larger (social) patterns . . . " and that educational change must reflect the needs of a society in which its goals and general orientation are shifting rapidly. Demographic changes and the " . . . basic increase in scale of society . . . " will result in greater centralized planning. The implicit rejection of middle class values, the death of the patriarchy, and the rising level of expectations in general point to a national tug of war over priorities and values in the middle of which the educational system will undoubtedly find itself.

The effects of increased affluence, the likely changes in corporate life and organization, and the potential emergence of full-fledged equalitarianism are explored in some detail, each exploration resulting in a new challenge to the system and its planners. Who shall be admitted? According to what standards? Are institutions of higher learning to continue to execute or expand their well-established noninstructional tasks such as adolescent-sitting and matchmaking? Should the trend away from diversity in structure and curricula be reversed or accelerated? And what is the role of the professional planner himself?

The planner, like the system he serves, is in a dichotomous situation, serving the legislature and the governor as a professional by recommending policies for adoption while serving individual institutions essentially as a layman by specifying the goals to be attained, but not the means for attaining them. It is in recognition of this dual role and of the rapidly changing patterns of social life that professional planners must accept the challenge to direct the educational

*Co-director. Academic Administration Project. Ellis L. Phillips Foundation.

system in the '70s and '80s toward greater diversity and adaptiveness and away from the sterile uniformity which has begun to characterize many of today's educational institutions, likening them to the "bland and uninspiring restaurants found on national turnpikes" (Myerson, 1966:737).

No reader of this volume needs to begin with 1636 and Harvard or even 1905 and Florida's Board of Regents. While the past is prologue, it is no more than that. Other documents adequately review the past (Palola et al., 1970:37-38): this volume looks to the future.

One reason for this future orientation is that trends in post-secondary education of the 1970s are not turning out to be extrapolations of those of the '50s and '60s. What were tendencies until last year are now no more than history, and planners must recalculate many of their projections. For example, the market of academic institutions beyond the high school has shifted dramatically in the past year. During the previous two decades, the college and university market was glutted with students at a time of seeming faculty shortage. Competing more for faculty than for freshmen, the institutions organized themselves for the benefit of faculty members in everything from instructional methods and teaching loads to office hours. Experienced professors came to expect increased prerequisites. The glut of student applications from the post-World War II baby boom allowed most institutions to say, in effect, "Take what our faculty offers or go elsewhere. We have other customers besides you." As a result, the faculty came to hold more power within American colleges than they ever had before.

The tables turned this past year. The market is now transformed: we presently face a glut of Ph.D.s and prospective professors; the baby boom is over; the age-cohort is declining; the draft may be ending. And since institutions always change in response to changes in their market, major shifts in power will be occurring in higher education in the next several years. Many institutions will be beating the bushes for students and will be able to be choosy about recruiting faculty. In short, if only for market reasons, the flight from teaching and the neglect of students is at least temporarily over.

In addition, other facts make the 1970s unpredictable. For instance, American higher education has recently expanded more rapidly than ever before in history. Between 1958 and 1969, academic enrollments doubled — from 3.2 million to 6.9 million. As a result, leadership was spread thin. At one major state university, for example, only half of the faculty have been there more than five years. And this rapid expansion has had its almost inevitable consequences — instability, confusion, uncertainty, waste, and scattered reduction in quality.

For this reason, many people now feel oversold — among them, government officials, some parents, and many students. After viewing higher education as the solution to other problems, more and more people are seeing it as a problem itself, and a few are using it as a scapegoat. "It is just possible that professors and students are actors in a vast comedy, a mad travesty of solemn ritual, wasted time, and trumped-up claims," mused David Boroff (1960) a decade ago, and now his speculation is widely shared.

Add to these changes the fluid political climate of the country; the current recession; the social and economic problems that confront local, state, and federal government and extrapolation seems unwise. Add as well the growing call for reform from within education itself and from philanthropy and government and redirection seems likely. As Martin Meyerson and Stephen Graubard put it at the Assembly on University Goals and Governance:

> An academic system that was forged in the latter decades of the 19th century . . . and was remarkably uncritical of itself in the 1950s and early 1960s when it grew to unprecedented dimensions, is now required to rethink its fundamental orientations (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1971:11).

TRENDS AFFECTING EDUCATION, THE STATES, AND STATEWIDE PLANNING

Postsecondary education of the future will, of course, grow out of the present structure of education beyond the high school; and colleges and universities will continue at least some of their past trends. Statewide planners naturally must understand this present structure and these trends in order to adapt them to the needs of the '70s and '80s. But far more important for them to consider than trends within education itself are the changing needs of society at large.

Education is not the dog that wags the tail of society. Educational programs, policies, and plans are only part of larger patterns. And to anticipate what American education beyond the high school will be a decade from now, one must first deduce what American society will be. Educational trends, in other words, will affect educational planning far less than trends in American life at large; whether, for example, Congress adopts a policy of national youth service, whether the authority pattern of American families continues to change, whether the puritan ethic continues to fade away, or even whether the Smiths decide to conceive rather than adopt a child. The most important question facing educational planning is how creatively planners will respond to these larger social trends: helping the educational system adapt to some of them, helping it meet and modify others.

Consider some trends of consequence to statewide planning and coordinating boards.

1. The demographic facts of life: increased longevity, a rising median age, the shape of the age pyramid, and shifts in the occupational structure. While planners know these facts (or if they don't, they'd better), they need to alert policy makers to the implications of these statistics for education, including the implications of the developing ten-hour, four-day work week and the possibility that eventually in some fields two people will share a single job on a three-and-one-half-day week.
2. The possible ramifications of the basic *increase in scale* of society as social life becomes more global, complex, and interdependent, and as the "system" expands. Higher levels of government will probably assume greater responsibility in social services. Formerly local options will become standardized at national levels; for example, highway design, voter registration, and educational plans. Personal relationships may grow increasingly impersonal rather than intimate: more and more, people's time may be spent in "segmental" roles as employees, customers, acquaintances, and bystanders. Certification and accreditation will most likely expand as education grows more institutional through schooling rather than by apprenticeship and by tutorial, one-to-one methods. Communication becomes more instantaneous; travel less time consuming; and with all these changes, the rate of change itself increases, leading to a need for people to learn to cope with change and "future-shock."

At the same time, Americans have never been fond of centralized planning. In fact, statewide boards for higher education have so far relegated their planning and research functions to a back burner (Glenny, 1959:265; Palola et al., 1970:59). But statewide planning will become increasingly imperative, and statewide plans will be increasingly affected by interstate and national decisions.

3. The implications of changes in people's attitudes and, in particular, their rising level of expectation. Patriarchy in society is declining with the demise of the belief that authority and judgment are necessarily determined by longevity of experience and, as part of it, that professors must naturally know more than their students. There is the seemingly worldwide phenomenon of youth's expectation to participate in life and decisions, including the decisions not only of schools and colleges but also of policy-making bodies such as statewide coordinating boards. With this phenomenon is the transformation of values occurring among some of the young, which Charles Reich has synthesized and brilliantly described in his *Greening of America:* a transformation encompassing an altered view of the world and of what it is to be human; a shift away from a scarcity-and-affluence mentality to one of "spaceship earth," where man of necessity consorts with nature rather than conflicts with her. Conflicts of value seem to be growing, and, as with all value conflicts, the educational system will find itself squarely in the middle of the fray.

All of these social trends will have repercussions on postsecondary education and on statewide and national planning for education. The impact of three additional trends is worth particular attention: those of affluence, of organizational or corporate life, and of equalitarianism.

Impact of Affluence

James Bryce, the British diplomat, historian, and political analyst, once pointed to the useful function that Oxford and Cambridge offered English society through their "pass" courses for the sons of the gentry and nobility. He remarked that they assigned lectures and examinations to these young men, "not so much with a view to their mental benefit as to prevent the evils which unchecked idleness would involve" (Bryce, 1913:398).

For better or worse, what Oxford and Cambridge did for the sons of elite England, American higher education is now doing for the sons and daughters of affluent America. Whether we like it or not (and many professors, students, and legislators do *not* like it), colleges increasingly exist to prevent the "evils of unchecked idleness." From the viewpoint of many parents, union leaders, social workers, and secretaries of labor, what better way to keep young people occupied beyond high school (as long, of course, as they don't believe all that their professors tell them) than to assign them even more classwork? Having them in college certainly is better than having them hanging around the street corner, cruising the avenues, or hitchhiking to Haight-Ashbury.

David Riesman and Christopher Jencks recognized this development over a decade ago when they sardonically compared American higher education to "a vast WPA project, which gives promising adolescents work to do while keeping them out of the job market, and also keeping several hundred thousand faculty members off the streets" (Riesman and Jencks, 1962:76). Now this trend is being questioned. Some students themselves are complaining of "involuntary servitude" and "detention-center education"; and, as George Weathersby notes later in this volume, "The thought of investing $15-20 billion to enable 7½ million budding artists to do their thing boils the blood and curls the hair of many citizens and legislators."

But the fact is plain that America has not yet invented any better social institution for youngsters to kill time by make-work. Americans have reluctantly been willing to underwrite higher education to keep youngsters occupied — and, hopefully, learning the right things. Neither the Civilian Conservation Corps nor University Military Training nor compulsory national service, VISTA, Job Corps, cooperative farms, nor community service have been satisfactory answers to the need; and a few young people have recently begun to develop their own answer — the commune.

Colleges and universities, it must be recognized by planners, perform a whole raft of important functions besides education (and, in some cases, instead of education) that so far are not performed by any other type of institution beyond the high school. Some academic planners, just as many professors, would rather forget about them, but they cannot: noncollegiate programs at the

postsecondary level are presently inadequate to tend to the needs of young people in America.

In affluence, colleges and universities also offer the most popular means yet devised of psychologically cutting the silver cord between adolescents and their parents. They are a half-way house to maturity, where families can hesitantly but gratefully send their offspring to try their own wings under the eye of parent surrogates. Thus, most American parents (at least until campus life became stereotyped by the violence and disruption of the late 1960s) have preferred to send their daughters off to a college dormitory (hopefully with a watchful resident assistant, if not a housemother) than to the suspected terrors of apartment life in the metropolis. And this opportunity for experimenting gradually with autonomy and maturity is a major function of higher education; a function that is inadequately performed by the commuter college in comparison to the residential, and one that is insufficiently recognized by educational planners.

Moreover, as you may recall from your own experience or that of your friends, American colleges perform a matchmaking function by introducing young men and women to eligible mates of similar background and interest. Most parents and students know that romance can be found more easily on campus than on the job — particularly as the tide toward coeducation continues. Today, even formerly puritanical religious colleges recognize this function; their public relations directors are wisely interlarding their catalogs with halftones of couples studying in the library, couples strolling across campus, and couples lounging by the nearest available brook.

These societal functions of adolescent-sitting, psychologic weaning, and matchmaking help explain why so many adults tend to feel out of place as students on the typical college campus, as well as why no other form of postsecondary education rivals the college in attraction and nostalgia. With the probable continued growth of affluence, a number of questions for planners are raised: What responsibility should be assumed for these and related functions? Are other options desirable for their performance? Could they be better achieved through additional structures?

Moreover, these functions raise a curricular problem for educators as well as educational planners. As several studies (Dressel and DeLeslie, 1969:74-77; Hefferlin, 1969:50-72) have documented, collegiate programs during the 1960s tended to become

more bookish, more academic, more seemingly irrelevant; and although much of this trend was due to the shortage of professors and the surplus of students, some of it stems from the increasing function of college as busy-work and higher education as time-killer. Relevance, apparently, has been unnecessary for time serving. What Henry Seidel Canby (1936) decried in the 1930s was becoming tragically true during the '60s:

> The faculty . . . had one of the great opportunities of educational history, and muffed it. . . . They taught physics for physicists, biology for biologists, history for historians. They were not interested in the American youth who was not going to be a specialist, a professor, but only a leader of industrial, commercial, political America.

Educational planners at both the institutional and the statewide level must help revise this curricular trend.

Impact of Organizational or Corporate Life

Just as adolescent-sitting, psychologic weaning, matchmaking, and other nonacademic functions will continue during affluence to be performed by colleges unless they are assumed by other postsecondary institutions as well, so will the most important function of higher education: certification. Job training (screening, funneling, and induction into occupational roles) has always dominated postsecondary education. General education for citizenship and culture typically fills in uncommitted time, ebbing and flowing from decade to decade as a reaction to general cultural crisis. But all societies have inequities of occupational power and status; every society has some means of selecting individuals for these positions; and ours, increasingly, uses the college and university.

Collegiate education has become, again for better or for worse, the single path to American middle class success which despite the communes and Charles Reich is still coveted by most students. No other route except academic higher education is now available to a high school graduate who wishes occupational status. Apart from the skilled trades, young adults find only the three limited fields, entertainment, art, and sports, open to them if they are not academically certified. Many professional sports now rely on intercollegiate athletes as their prime recruiting group. All the major professions have integrated their own recruitment and train-

ing programs into collegiate education; as a result, colleges and universities have collectively approached the status of a monopoly over late adolescence in American culture. As Edward Gibbon said regarding the monopoly of Oxford and Cambridge over eighteenth-century England, "The spirit of monopolists is narrow, lazy, and oppressive" (Trevelyan, 1937:26).

For students, it now looks as if they have no future if they quit or fall off the school ladder, despite the increasing popularity of dropping out. With higher education as the funnel into high status employment, college attendance seems both mandatory and coercive. This, more than any other fact, explains the continued rise in the proportion of young people attending college. A century ago, in 1870, one out of every 737 Americans was attending a college or university. By 1900, the number was one out of every 319; by 1960, one out of every 52; and by 1970, one out of every 25. Unless America plans other routes to high status employment, the proportion of Americans going to college will continue to rise.

Some analysts predict that fewer students will be interested in college because the value of a bachelor's degree relative to the demand for college trained individuals will decline as more and more of the work force earn it. So far these predictions have been wrong. The fact that more young people have been gaining the degree has made it an increasingly necessary certificate for the rest in attaining or maintaining status. This function of doorkeeper to opportunity, coupled with the other functions of colleges and universities, has come to mean to most Americans that if you are enrolled in college, you are somebody. If you enroll in the RCA Institute, you are nobody.

Before considering the implications of this fact for planners in terms of admissions policies and degree-granting privileges, observe the likely effects of this certification function on collegiate education in the future. Some other trends are difficult to predict, but unless massive alterations occur in employment practices and student interests, the following tendencies seem likely:

1. Colleges will increasingly possess the characteristics of the occupational world. To learn an occupational role, one must be prepared to role-play — to make the grade, to beat the system, to survive. "The most important thing learned in college may not be physics or history but the importance of credentials

and the art of acquiring them," Jencks and Riesman (1968:63) have suggested, and they have tried to alert educators to the danger that a college degree may signify only diligence, disciplined accomplishment of work not of one's own devising, and ". . . a good yardstick for determining who will do well in highly organized and authoritarian settings."

2. If higher education continues merely to accommodate itself to corporate life of this sort, most educational programs will seek to prepare students for success at highly technical work which is increasingly specialized, frequently impersonal, sometimes meaningless. A few institutions may try to maintain a counter goal toward breadth, toward community, toward meaning, but they will be in the minority.
3. In sharp contrast to their noninstructional, adolescent-sitting role, some institutions will attempt to become "academic pressure cookers," raising their expectations of achievement by adopting a quality-control philosophy of education, a philosophy here labeled the "OSS syndrome," which states, in essence, "We guarantee that our graduates will be able to perform under tolerable conditions because we have put them through the most intolerable conditions we could devise, and they have survived."* In certifying the sheep and weeding out the goats, these institutions will reject responsibility for failure. On the other hand, a few institutions will try to retain a larger mission of teaching, counseling, encouraging, and assisting the average.
4. Many institutions, following the increase in scale of society and bureaucracy, will seek to grow larger, employing greater division of labor and compartmentalizing time and human relationships. In contrast, a few — such as the new cluster colleges within some universities — will deliberately try to foster a sense of shared time and community among their members, with students and professors participating in many roles.
5. Many institutions will move towards only segmental involve-

*This philosophy of hurdle-jumping and discarding the rejects, epitomized during World War II by the OSS (Office of Strategic Services) is a perfectly acceptable approach to education as long as everyone knows that it is the philosophy and as long as the hurdles are relevant to later tasks. These two conditions have unfortunately not been met by most academic institutions recently operating on this basis.

ment in the life of students, as opposed to the traditional residential college which provided round-the-clock incarceration. The trend will be towards part-time attendance on a transient commuter basis at essentially anonymous, open institutions. A few campuses, on the other hand, will try to remain as enclaves, and some private colleges may even allow some students to use their campus as a hang-out, paying tuition but not working for the ordinary degree. (Legislators and taxpayer associations will not tolerate this arrangement at publicly supported institutions, except possibly for intervarsity athletes.)

6. Although many socially conscious faculty members are presently entering the professoriate because they see no other occupational outlet for their creativity and concern, the dominant aim of professors will move toward the goal of cognitive development among students and away from that of personal as well as intellectual growth; toward the historical German ideal of pure intellectualism and away from the British and American college concern for the development of the whole person; toward "cerebralism" and away from "wholism." Many faculty members will disclaim responsibility for affecting their students beyond a narrowly defined range of academic and vocational skills. ("If he commits suicide, it's the dean's problem — not mine.") Even professors of the humanities will be concerned only for verbal aptitude and "appreciation"; fewer of them will share a goal of education in the humanities as embracing tolerance, reasonableness, sympathy, civic responsibility, or, as Howard Mumford Jones (1960) put it, the goal of learning that "people shouldn't push other people around."
7. In contrast, hopefully, a few faculty members will continue to believe that the aim of education lies in helping students become more humane and not merely more rational, that altruism may be as basic a human characteristic for the survival of civilization as reason, and that education is not merely the acquisition of knowledge but is instead, in Whitehead's (1949:16) words, "the acquisition of the art of the *utilisation* of knowledge."

Scholars at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education have data indicating that numerous colleges, particularly the two-year community colleges, are trying to maintain a

broad concept of education and to offer a variety of educational options beyond the common mold of gatekeeper or funnel. Later in this volume, George Weathersby outlines a variety of educational models that can exist beyond the high school. It will be a disaster if this diversity continues to decline, and educational planners must alert policy makers to the consequences of uniformity and standardization. They must not be the unwitting instruments of historic trends such as those listed above if such trends are to be controlled. Unless they plan for diversity, educational institutions will continue to grow more uniform and ". . . as bland and uninspired as turnpike restaurants" (Meyerson, 1966:737).

Impact of Equalitarianism

Probably no social trend will have more influence on statewide and national planning for postsecondary education than the continued strain towards equality: the decline of class system, of racial barriers, of male dominance, of unearned privilege and ascribed status, and the growing belief that government and the law must combat inequality throughout social life, including education.

Within higher education, this equalitarian tendency has overwhelmed not only the aristocratic tradition of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but also the "meritocratic" standards of more recent decades which restricted college attendance to the intellectually elite. As Patricia Cross (1971a:13), the primary scholar of this educational development, has observed, what was once the option only of the rich and more recently only of the able is becoming the opportunity of the many. While debates range over higher education as a "privilege" or a "right," the facts demonstrate that higher education is already a necessity. Presently (unless, again, the events of the late '60s changed many minds) almost every American parent *hopes* for college attendance for his child and nearly this same total *expects* it (Froomkin, 1970:14). Until other options are open, colleges must admit all who seek entry.

Dr. Cross (1971a:13) describes the motivation of the new groups of students who are seeking admission in these words:

> Fundamentally these New Students to higher education are swept into college by the rising educational aspirations of the citizenry. For the majority, the motivation for college does not arise from the anticipation of the joy of learning the things they will be learning in college, but from the recognition that education is the way to a better job and a better life than that of their parents.

Contrary to some impressions, these additional students seeking admission to college in the '70s will not be simply from minority groups of Blacks, Chicanos, and Native Americans. Instead they will be predominantly white children from blue-collar working-class families with low scholastic records throughout their previous schooling. Already most boys with high grades from poor families are continuing on to college. From now on, the additional students will be poor both financially and scholastically; and since traditional teaching methods have failed with them in high school, conventional college programs will be even more inadequate for them.

Most educational planners now agree that access to higher education for all students should be equalized. Equalitarians such as Dr. Cross go further and call not only for access, but also for accommodation. They hold that the past decade was devoted primarily to removing barriers to admission and to offering remedial programs throughout elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education so that students could fit into the existing system; they claim that the '70s must be devoted to changing the system to fit the students by accommodating educational programs to student needs. According to Dr. Cross,

> The emphasis will change from moving students toward higher education to moving education toward students. The 1970s have brought the realization that success at academic tasks in the past is not an infallible predictor of success in the future, especially when past opportunities for learning have not been equal for groups of differing locales, ethnic backgrounds, and socioeconomic status. . . . Both access and accommodation are designed to narrow the gap between educational opportunities and students, and both are important. But access predominated in the '60s; accommodation must receive the major attention of the '70s (Cross, 1971b:5).

Planners will have their hands full if they work for accommodation: the evidence of curricular rigidity, faculty prerogatives, the disciplinary orientation of departments all point to major obstacles. So does the evidence that typical faculty reaction to "open admissions" has been to teach the same old material in the same way, letting the disenchanted and disillusioned among their students quickly fall by the wayside. Inadequate planning will merely result in more of the same.

Planners will face equal challenges when they begin to question, as they must, not only admission policies but degree requirements.

Most educational institutions establish graduation requirements and then proceed to admit as students those who already come the closest to meeting these requirements. This admission policy obviously guarantees success; whether it is socially desirable is open to question. Similarly the practice of awarding degrees on the basis of chair-sitting and credit-accumulation, rather than on the basis of experience and achievement alone should be and more and more *is being* challenged. Must, in fact, a bachelor's degree be a necessary requirement for beginning a graduate program? Can the practical nurse become a registered professional nurse without repeating the entire professional nursing curriculum? Can the dental technician bypass unnecessary prerequisites to become a dentist? Should other agencies besides colleges and universities serve to award occupational credentials and even academic degrees?

These questions of educational equity, like the earlier ones raised by affluence and corporate bureaucracy, need the attention of planners. Together they point to deficiencies in the structure of American postsecondary education.

Educational Tracks

The United States operates a two-track system of education beyond the high school: one track is that of academic degree institutions represented most commonly by colleges and universities, and the other is the unsystematic collection of nondegree educational institutions and programs throughout the rest of society.

The relationship between these two tracks will be of increased concern to education planners during the '70s, since pressure is developing for greater rapproachment between academia and its nondegree counterparts. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, for example, is calling for wider educational options outside of college as well as for "stop-outs" and greater flexibility within college; the HEW task force on higher education recommended in March that academic opportunities be dispersed throughout communities and beyond colleges and universities by means of governmental intervention; New York State is taking the lead in developing external degrees and credentials; and more and more people are coming to the conclusion that we have tended to make "schooling" synonymous with "education" to the detriment of both.

So far, the dominant track of postsecondary institutions that award degrees has operated on the premise that admission to one

level depends on graduation from an appropriate program at the lower level. Thus, although high schools and colleges offer terminal programs for students who don't plan to stay on the track to further degrees, they are primarily interested in serving the needs of the other students who are continuing in the system.

Nondegree programs typically are not so sequential. Admission to them less frequently requires academic credentials; completion seldom leads to additional courses but to work or practice. Ranging from intensely specialized technical courses within industry and the military to neighborhood and community leisure-time sessions on great books and famous movies, these nondegree programs are estimated to enroll over eight times as many students as academic higher education does: up to 60 million registrants in 1970 compared to 7 million attending colleges and universities.*

These nondegree programs of education beyond the high school continue to diversify, but the dominant structural trend of the academic track of postsecondary education during the past half-century has not been diversification but *isomorphism:* the increased resemblance of formerly diverse types. Normal schools, liberal arts colleges, technical institutes, seminaries, even some community colleges have tended toward what Warren Bryan Martin (1969:229) has dubbed the one-model box of the "versity" coming in three sizes — the miniversity, the university, and the multiversity — and epitomized by the comprehensive state university, containing as it does elements of the undergraduate college, the technical institute, the graduate school, experiment station, chautauqua, lyceum, correspondence school, boarding house, finishing school, encounter group, and museum. Within this system, institutions naturally emulate those of the next higher level. Second-rate colleges try to become first-rate by transforming themselves into third-rate universities; and "vertical extension," as Harold Hodgkinson (1970) expresses it, offers institutions the one means of social climbing. As Hodgkinson states from his recent study of structural trends among colleges and universities:

> Taken as a whole, the amount of institutional diversity in American higher education is decreasing. This is due partially to the pervasive existence of a single status system in higher education,

*These figures include double counting, where an individual enrolled in two programs may be counted twice ("Notes on the Learning Force," 1970:7).

based on the prestigious university, offering many graduate programs and preoccupied with research. There are few alternative models to this system now functioning.

This tendency toward isomorphism and the dominance of the multiversity illustrates the fact that throughout history, colleges and universities have expanded in scope and service by gradually adopting formerly nonacademic programs. After assuring themselves of the respectability of these programs, they have eventually proceeded to award academic degrees to the students enrolled in them. In this way the modern foreign languages became academically respectable by the mid-nineteenth century and the sciences by the turn of the twentieth. During the first half of this century, colleges came to tolerate academic credit not only for the analysis of art but slowly for its creation and performance as well. They have admitted the new technologies, one by one, with computer programming being one of the most recently accepted; and this broadening trend will continue into the future, being fought every step of the way by the academic rear-guard as "anti-intellectual." During the '70s, credit will come to be awarded by more and more institutions for *service* — not only service to the institution itself (for example, through membership on institutional committees), but also service to the community beyond the college. In sum, American academic institutions continue to expand bit by bit their meaning of what is academic. They slowly encompass sections of the educational enterprise previously occupied only by nondegree programs, allowing and forcing nondegree programs to advance into new fields of knowledge and activity.*

Planners have several options open to them in effecting this process of expansion other than the tactic of allotting more funds to students directly and less to institutions. They can offer degree-granting institutions the carrot of restricted funds to hasten the natural extension of their programs and the admission of students on broader bases than academic passports, thus encouraging both

*No intrinsic difference exists between the knowledge or achievement that earns an academic degree and that which doesn't. The essential characteristic of a degree-granting educational institution is not the social status of its subject matter nor the restricted utility of its curriculum, but rather the openness of its teaching and its toleration of opposing evidence. A degree-granting educational institution must have leeway to probe the future as a center of independent thought: of necessity it will sometimes seem to bite the hand that feeds it, but planners must both expect it to and assure that it can.

accommodation and access. Or they can use the whip of financial support to institutions other than colleges and the offer of degree-granting privileges to these competing programs, thus stimulating competition and encouraging all institutions to be more responsive to their students.

The most effective plans for structural reform probably will embrace both of these tactics. New functions in higher education have always required the stimulus of restricted funds, the threat of competition, and new structures and new personnel to assure that acceptance, just as the introduction of technology through the new land-grant colleges illustrated the point a century ago and as cluster colleges and nondepartmental programs illustrate it today. Sir Nevill Mott sagely noted, "The infallible recipe for stirring up a university is to set up a rival." (New York Times, 1965:11). For better or for worse, in higher education as elsewhere, no priesthood institutes its own reforms; at least, not until the necessity to reform becomes overwhelming.

PROFESSIONALISM AND PLANNING

This problem of institutional reform points to one last social trend that will increasingly affect educational institutions and educational planners: the growth within society of professionalism and a concomitant development of *syndicalism* — the belief that every interest group, such as a profession, should be autonomous. Under this theory, physicians should control the practice of medicine, labor unions should control industry, professors and administrators should control higher education, and, more immediately, professional planners should control planning.

This syndicalist theory has never won wide acceptance in the United States, although it came to be the operating principle of some universities during the past decade as they became, in effect, holding companies for their faculties, providing professors with the research space, assistants, pencils, and paper clips they needed, but having no other institutional purpose than the conglomerate of individual aims of their faculty members.

One reason why this syndicalist philosophy has never become more widespread is the fact that professionalism itself tends to bring with it suspicion of the professional. Most Americans probably agree that war is indeed too important to be left to the generals,

that medical care is too vital to be left to the American Medical Association, that higher education is too costly to be left to the faculty and administration, and that educational planning is too significant to be left only to p' nning boards.

With the growth of professionalism, however, conflict inevitably arises between professionals and laymen over the prerogatives, privileges, and responsibilities of the professions. Who, for instance, should be eligible for admission to professional practice? Who should specify these admissions standards? Who should control certification, licensure, and reevaluation policies and examinations?

The conflict over such questions regarding the professoriate focuses on issues in academic governance of appointment and tenure, departmental autonomy, and curricular decision-making, with widespread disagreement over the respective roles of faculty members, administrators, students, trustees, coordinating boards, budget officers, legislatures, and governors, and with everyone seeming to want to get in to the act. Within the planning profession, similar conflict is likely to increase between professional planning staffs, their employing agencies, and the subjects of their planning.

A. Lawrence Lowell offered one piece of wise counsel regarding these professional rights and responsibilities when, as president of Harvard, he was trying to educate Harvard's Board of Overseers to their role. "Laymen should not attempt to direct experts about the method of attaining results," he proposed, "but only indicate the results to be obtained" (Lowell, 1921:25).

This distinction that Lowell made between ends and means will not solve all of the conflicts over professionalism, but it is basic to understanding the separate responsibilities of professionals and laymen. Laymen must have the ultimate right to specify goals, but professionals must have the right to choose means consistent with these goals. That is, just as a patient cannot rightly tell his physician the medication he should prescribe for the relief of pain and just as a legal client cannot tell his counsel how to handle his case, so laymen in general must avoid dictating to professionals the means by which they are to reach specified goals.

A faculty senate, for example, may rightly set specifications for an institution's degrees, but it should ordinarily trust departments and professors to evaluate each of the required accomplishments for the degrees. Similarly a university governing board should rightly determine degree goals, but it must ordinarily leave

decisions about the means of meeting these goals to the faculty. A state legislature and governor can rightfully establish policies and assign priorities for state programs of education, but they must leave the choice of the most effective means to these ends to the boards and specialists connected with each of them.

The professional planner and the statewide coordinating board find themselves exactly in the middle of this dual relationship. On the one hand, to the legislature and the governor they are professionals. As such, they must recommend policies for adoption; but decisions about these policies rest with elected officials while alternatives for implementing them remain with the board. On the other hand, in dealing with individual institutions, the planner and board are not professionals, knowledgeable about separate campuses and their operation; they are laymen, and they must leave the means of attaining results up to campus experts.

The techniques that states are using to plan and coordinate postsecondary education is the topic of the following chapters. How skillfully planners and coordinators carry out their dual responsibility will, in large part, determine whether postsecondary education in America grows more diverse and adaptive during the 1970s or more uniform and rigid, whether it simply mirrors the dominant trends in society or becomes a model for adapting creatively to them, affecting them for the better.

PART II

Designs for Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education

CHAPTER 4

Alternative Conceptual Models of Postsecondary Education

George B. Weathersby*

OVERVIEW

In order to deal with the issues and challenges laid down in Part I, new methods of analysis are needed. Chapter 4 presents alternative conceptual models of postsecondary education for this purpose, models which " . . . correspond to various institutional objectives and missions." Postsecondary education is viewed alternately as (1) an instrument for the socialization of youth and a defender of the status quo and (2) a factory whose product meets national manpower needs. (This model is the basis for much of the statewide planning to date.) The complement to this economic macromodel is also explored, viz., the human capitalists' microview of education as a piece of equipment with a large initial cost which produces a lifelong stream of income for the purchaser.

Postsecondary education is also modeled as (3) an educational utility analogous to public gas companies, (4) a developer of the Renaissance "whole man," (5) the provider of an environment for developing human relationships and succeeding in "Consciousness III," (6) a house of creativity in which each member is unique and the good of the state is achieved through "the creative interaction of students and scholars," and finally as (7) an instrument for effecting social change.

Each of these models has been supported explicitly or implicitly by policy makers and/or students in the past, but " . . . each has very different implications for who makes the major decision, who receives the primary benefits, and who pays the direct costs." The policy characteristics of these models and the interactions between the various objectives are given in a table at the end of the chapter.

---

*Associate Director, Office of Analytical Studies, and Director, Ford Foundation Research Program in University Administration, University of California.

INTRODUCTION

Our point of departure for improved planning of postsecondary education is the recognition and acceptance of the observation that postsecondary education, along with the society that supports it, is beseiged by fundamental, pervasive, persistent problems which challenge both the facade and the foundations of our social institutions and deny the relevance of most of today's postsecondary education. Our young people, who supposedly receive the major benefits of postsecondary education, are skeptical of educators' traditional claims, repulsed by society's surface values, and unimpressed by the myths and mystiques learned disciplines cant in medieval fashion to students huddled in gigantic lecture halls by otherwise unemployable academicians. Berg (1970:184-5) describes the disaffection of today's students:

> They charge that education focuses on vocational placement in a society of buttondown personalities and grey-flannel mouths, competing to breathe the technicians' poliuted air, to drive the engineers' beached whales on crowded cement ribbons that choke the planners' cities. Education mirrors a society, they argue, in which liberation is confused with "upward mobility," and in which human relationships are confounded with the ritual behavior of the polite middle class. One may conjure up an image of an educated community in which the inanities of cocktail-party patter regularly pass for conversation, in which clam dip serves as social cement, in which work is a job and not labor, crabgrass is the evil goddess to whom one kneels in Sunday terror, spiritual values are high-proof, neutral, and pure grain, and suburban husbands are handymen with sex privileges.

Our basic tenet in this discussion is that the application of careful reasoning and analysis can assist concerned administrators and participants in postsecondary education to sort out the multitudinous purposes and missions appropriate and available to our institutions; to consider the numerous administrative policies and operational decisions which move an institution towards its purposes; and to choose one of these many alternatives (the planning process). One of the current difficulties in discussing the nature and process of postsecondary education is absence of a sufficient vocabulary which embodies both the essence and the connotations of the purposes of postsecondary education. Therefore, this chapter develops several conceptual models of postsecondary education which correspond to various institutional objectives and missions.

PROCRUSTEAN BED OF CITIZENSHIP

The socialization of its youth is often viewed as one of the major functions of a society's educational system. Both parents and political leaders are concerned that our youth revere the accepted set of social, political, and religious values; know how to function effectively in a complicated, urban, industrialized society; appreciate and support our legal system; participate as responsible voters; willingly serve in socially or economically useful employment; and, above all, defend the status quo. In assisting the transition between a small, supportive nuclear family and our large, impersonal, industrialized society, our schools teach students to wait their turn, to stand in line, to expect little personal satisfaction from their daily activities, to subjugate their will to the wishes of their group, to accept unquestioningly the authority of their teachers, and to abide by hundreds of arbitrary regulations covering everything from the distribution of paper in kindergarten to irrelevant foreign language examinations in graduate school.

Without a relatively high degree of attitudinal conformity, many leaders fear the laws will not be obeyed, social grievances will be aired and their resolutions sought outside of existing political structures, and that American society will follow the ancient Greek and Roman societies into violent upheavals and ultimately into a cataclysmic Armageddon. While these fears may be overstated, the effective functioning of a person in our society does require the acceptance of some behavioral conformity; some knowledge of contracts, mortgages, criminal and civil codes; some perspective of American domestic and foreign policies; and some appreciation of man's historical experience.

The Procrustean bed of citizenship stretches or cuts the personal social values of our youth to fit the mores and tenets of our society. This model of education was prominent in the 1930s, when, gripped by the spectre of the depression and haunted by the apparition of Communism, American educators stressed social adjustment over intellectual development, citizenship over scholarship. As Conant (1964:4) described it:

> With the exception of certain schools in certain localities, those who determined policy in the 1930s and 1940s were primarily concerned with education for democracy, and placed great emphasis first in the development of those attitudes that were believed essential to citizens of a free society and second on the

> free development of a wide range of skills among all pupils. The contrast between what was recommended and the old-fashioned "purely academic" curriculum was underlined in books and articles by professors of education and forward-looking educational administrators. One could hardly quarrel with this emphasis in a period of our history when free societies were threatened all over the world. But one consequence was that the content of the academic high school (or college) curriculum made little difference.

Even today, Kaysen (1969:8) argues that in addition to the roles of postsecondary education in the creation of new knowledge, the transmission of knowledge to a new generation, and the application of knowledge to the solution of social problems is the contribution postsecondary education makes to

> . . . the socialization of late adolescents and young adults, teaching them how to fit into the social roles they will fill as adults. This is closely connected with the transmission of culture, but distinct from it, dealing rather with the formation of values and habits, the selection of life styles, and the making of friendships. than with cognitive knowledge.

MANPOWER FACTORY

Our economic paradigm of postsecondary education is a system in which the vocational interests of students are matched (or modified to conform) to the specialized manpower needs of the national economy. In this model, raw material (students) enters the factory (educational institution) where it is processed (educated) and stamped into desired shapes (occupations) before being inspected (degree certification) and sold to the final consumer (business, government, or other educational institutions). This conceptualization is the basis for much of the traditional economic analysis of education.*

Furthermore, the economists' model of education has been the analytical approach most used for statewide and national educational planning. The basic economic argument is as follows: Economic productivity (GNP) is a function of a nation's physical, fiscal, and human resources and the state of their technology. The production of a country's various goods and services depends upon the number and skill level of the labor force which in turn depend upon the number of people educated and their particular curricular

*See Bowles (1969), Chapters I and II, for a discussion of the economic model of educational planning. An extensive list of references is included.

programs. Finally, the educational system is a function of national (or state) policies and is usually regarded as almost fully controllable by national (or state) decision makers. Conversely, the argument suggests that a society can affect its long-run economy, including unemployment, wages, and the real rate of growth, by carefully examining its educational investments (Bowles, 1969; Parnes, 1968:263).

In addition to this economic macroview of the role of education and public policy, there is the economic microview of the student choosing a lifetime pattern of investment and consumption. The human capitalists' argument is that a trained individual can sell his intellectual services in the marketplace and thereby realize a stream of income from his educational investments. In this view, attending postsecondary education is analogous to purchasing a piece of equipment that has large initial cost but produces a stream of income (or rent) throughout its useful working life. Consequently, the human capitalists analyze attendance in postsecondary education in terms of the economic return to the student in the form of increased lifetime earnings (Schultz, 1968:13; Becker, 1964).

These two approaches have great appeal because both the economic costs and the economic benefits appear to be easily and acceptably measurable. A prototype manpower planning approach has been tested in six Western European countries with less than the anticipated success because of the vague and unstable relationships between the skill composition of the country's labor force and the output of its economy (Bowles, 1969:141). Truthfully, economists do not know or agree upon the "right" mix of skills, preparation, and certifications needed for systematic improvement of a nation's economy. In practice, manpower planners assume that the current distribution of skills is the best possible distribution.

Meanwhile, researchers have amassed an impressive amount of data of reliable quality which indicates that in the United States' economy there is very little relationship between educational background or training and on-the-job performance (Berg, 1970). On the contrary, many college-trained employees are less satisfied and less productive than their noncollege-trained colleagues. Nevertheless, each year the number of jobs requiring a bachelor's degree increases as academic certification is increasingly used in initial employee selection. In most fields, the institutional awarding of

degrees is demanded by potential employers more as an indicator of personal persistence than of intellectual achievement.

The human capital approach with its analogy to a "cog in the wheel" affronts the humanistic sensibilities of many educators as well as students. Furthermore, it is not clear that most students make their decisions on the basis of future personal income. On the contrary, the increasing student interest in community services (law, business, medicine, education); the return-to-the-land communal movement; and the diminished interest in the professionally oriented sciences and technologies, coupled with the increased interest in the humanities, indicate that future employment is not the *raison d'etre* of many of today's college students. Judging from the reluctance of interminably continuing graduate students to leave the academic womb, the enticement of future earnings does not appear to be as strong as human capitalists would have us believe.

EDUCATIONAL UTILITY

Public utility companies, such as gas, water, electric, and telephone companies, are socially regulated and supported monopolies that provide special services to the general populace. No one is forced to subscribe to any of these services, and there are no special restrictions placed on how and to what purpose one uses these services. Operationally, a public utilities board sets a rate at which each consumer can purchase as much or as little as he wishes and use as he pleases. In essence, this is the model of many programs of "continuing education," "life long learning," "university extension," and similar programs.

The objective of an educational utility is to meet student demands for admission and curriculum offerings where "student" can be defined as either the general population (educational TV) or regularly matriculated students (extension degree programs). In its extreme characterization, an institution acts as a pure educational utility when it allows students to drive up, pay their fees, plug in for four years of educational experience, and then depart, satisfied that, at least, they had made their own choices.

Certification is the principal obstacle to this approach because it is the carrot and stick with which students are led through regular degree programs and because it is a major justification for public financial support of postsecondary education. For essentially the

same reasons, certification is a major barrier to the expanded participation of part-time students, the intellectually curious non-students, and a variety of other (and new) clienteles. Moreover, certification *per se* is irrelevant to an educational utility and represents a service to potential employers or the general public rather than to the students.

A utility views its output primarily as service which enables the user to manufacture his products and manage his business more efficiently or to enjoy a life style that would not otherwise be available at a feasible cost. On the other hand, postsecondary education often feels its purpose is to produce academically trained, degree-certified individuals as opposed to providing a variety of intellectual and emotional encounters from which students may choose as they walk the aisles of their educational supermarket. The electric company is not responsible for the success or failure of a manufacturing firm just because it uses electrical power. The telephone company does not give "good dialer awards" for those users who display digital dexterity with their products, and what evidence exists suggests that postsecondary education institutions should not claim credit for the observed academic accomplishments of their students. But where does this leave traditional postsecondary education?

"WHOLE MAN" SYNDROME

There is a sizable school of thought that argues that occupational training is the proper concern of technical and vocational institutes, but "true education" is the disciplining of one's mind and the strengthening of one's character through vigorous study. It is not only banal and pedestrian for a "true educator" to concern himself with his students' occupational success, it is also somewhat immoral to dwell on social status and money — unless, of course, faculty salaries are being negotiated.

With Socratic purity, the "whole man" searches for Platonic forms, Diogenean truth, and a deep, personal comprehension of the essence of human existence. The unity of this search is its focus on the writings of great philosophers, humanists, and scientists. In the Roman tradition of the higher arts pursued by free men, this quest is the core of classical liberal arts and ideally represents not merely instruction, but a resonance of empathic souls.

Edward Levi (1969) argues:

Universities and colleges have kept alive the tradition of the life of the mind. They have continued the traditions of culture and rediscovered cultures which had died. They have inculcated an appreciation for the works of the mind, developed the skills of the intellect, emphasized the continuing need for free inquiry and discussion, the importance of scientific discovery, the need to understand the nonrational. Thus they have stood for the concept of the wholeness of knowledge, for the morality of that intellectual criticism which is so difficult because it is self-criticism, requiring the admission of error. They have helped to create a thoughtfulness about values. They have held to the conception that these skills, this appreciation, this examination of values, this way of inquiry are the possession of the free man to be acquired through education. This is what a liberal education is about, and its illumination is essential if graduate and professional work are to participate in the intellectual tradition.

There are several hundred liberal arts colleges in the United States founded upon these or similar principles, emphasizing the development of the "whole" man or woman. The University of Chicago's Great Books program initiated by Robert Hutchins was one of the more recent revivals of this ideal. This concept also motivates some of the new collegiate structures, such as the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California, with their focus on interdisciplinary programs. However, the disciplinary allegiances of faculty are very strong, with the consequence that they identify far more with their disciplinary colleagues throughout the world than with other faculty members in the same institution.

ENVIRONMENT FOR HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

For those individuals who are striving for "Consciousness III," the nature and quality of personal relationships is the essence of meaningful existence and the objective of their educational experience. Our industrial notions of productivity and output imply a quantifiable transformation (a piece of steel being stamped into a fender) and some tangible product whether it is reading test scores or knowledge of physics. However, it is currently argued that these notions are not only inapplicable, but may be misleading because they do not encompass the transformation of human relationships.

Our society has long recognized and rewarded creative individuals in the arts, music, science, architecture, drama, and other imaginative fields. Each of these inventors creates something that

is generally perceivable — a painting, a score, an experimental result, a house, a play, or whatever. However, the creation of rewarding and supportive relationships between individuals and groups of individuals is an equally worthy endeavor. Furthermore, the development of human relationships can provide a nexus between other forms of creativity. In this view, art and music structure a sensuous environment that enables and enhances human relationships. The purpose of science is to reduce the physical and technological barriers between people by improving communication, transportation, health; minimizing monotonous work; and providing sources of enjoyment (stereos, TVs, etc.). Similarly, architects could design houses that support human interaction, authors could write novels that would advise and encourage individuals in their relationships, and so forth.

Institutions of postsecondary education become the focus of these concerns, partly because the youth are the most numerous and passionate advocates of "Consciousness III" and partly because educational institutions have traditionally encouraged both critical and innovative thinking. Furthermore, many of the concepts of the counterculture stand in stark contradistinction to the current values of most of postsecondary education. There is no need to dwell upon traditional academic material unless its comprehension fosters human relationships. Grading, competition, sorting, and certification are all anathemas because they serve to classify and segregate individuals on an arbitrary basis. Interpersonal communication focuses on symbol manipulation (the capitalistic establishment, the military-industrial-university complex, complicity with the war) rather than content and is supported by belief rather than logical proof. Finally, the process of education (campuses, classes, concerts) serves to get people together, while the products of education (grades, degrees, acquired knowledge) splits people apart. Consequently, educational administrators straddle the dilemma of retaining the process, which many students (and radicals) want, without eliminating the products, which industry, government, and employers desire.

ART FORM

In its external behavior a gas seems very uniform and orderly, its macroproperties characterized by the measurable quantities of

pressure, volume, and temperature which obey a strict physical law. On the contrary, the behavior of an individual gas molecule is very irregular and random, the macroconcepts of pressure, volume, and temperature are meaningless when applied to a single molecule; instead, one must look to the much more complicated properties of mass, velocity, and position to describe the probabilities associated with the intricate path of each molecule. However, just as the combined behavior of individual gas molecules determines the character of the gas, the behavior of people can be combined to determine overall group behavior, which is all that matters to most observers.

This analogy is often applied to institutions of postsecondary education to justify the derivation of a set of externally relevant indicators of internal activity such as the student/faculty ratio, average class size, average faculty workload, mean time to a degree, and so forth. No one should argue that these same measures are relevant to every individual student or faculty member. However, the proponents of the art-form model of postsecondary education argue that it fundamentally does not make sense to "average" individual behavior in a creative enterprise. What is the average of a Picasso and a Warhol, of a sculpture and a musical score, of a physics student and a philosophy student? In other words, the participants in postsecondary education are so dissimilar and so mutually dependent that their aggregation produces a meaningless sum and an even more meaningless average.

Meanwhile, the behavior of creative individuals is equally diverse and interactive and, therefore, insusceptible to simple characterization and measurement. Every student and scholar "does his thing" as he chooses. Presumably, the public, like Roman patricians, should support the creative interaction of students and scholars for the general good of the state (or nation) as another form of cultural enhancement. And socially useful products of this creative enterprise should be gratefully received and recognized as an uncontrollable and unplanned by-product.

Clearly, this view is at odds with some of the earlier models and with the prevailing public view of postsecondary education. The thought of investing $15-20 billion to enable 7½ million budding artists to do their thing boils the blood and curls the hair of many citizens and legislators. On the other hand, the external ratios and averages are clearly inapplicable to individual students

or faculty members, who respond to mismeasurement by denying the possibility of any measurement and demand public support as an act of faith. Somewhere in between lies accountability.

INSTRUMENT FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

A society that is concerned about its economic and social well-being can use postsecondary education as an active agent for social and economic change. Particularly in the last century, ethnic and cultural minorities have viewed postsecondary education as the pathway to the American Dream, and various occupational and social mobility studies suggest that this view is largely correct. However, those who are denied regular admission to postsecondary education are doubly cursed, once because they do not have the opportunity to develop their own critical reasoning and factual knowledge, and once because they are at a competitive disadvantage with those who do attend postsecondary education. Thus, postsecondary education is a tool that can be used for both social uplifting and social repression, and this fact is well understood by minority students today.

In addition to facilitating upward social and occupational mobility of talented young people, postsecondary education can also provide midcareer training for individuals whose skills are no longer needed by our rapidly changing society. With the expected lifetime of today's youth nearing 90 or 100 years, the former notion of *a* career (or even *a* family, if we are to believe modern authors) may have to be replaced by the notion of a series of careers, with individuals in transition turning to new forms of postsecondary education for assistance in their retraining.

This process of reorientation and specialized instruction serves an additional purpose of cushioning short term business recessions by absorbing the released manpower in a useful pursuit (education) that will serve their immediate needs of employment. For example, during the recession of 1970 the aerospace industry was hit particularly hard, and many technically well trained people found themselves unemployable for the first time in a decade. Unfortunately, postsecondary education did not possess the resources and the flexibility to respond adequately to their needs, but the opportunity clearly existed to reorient their interests and skills to focus on the many pressing social problems of this decade.

Institutions of postsecondary education also serve as catalysts for social change by developing new, socially useful products: new transportation systems, improved medical care delivery systems, lower legal costs, better urban design and use of open spaces, new highway design and traffic safety techniques, more effective criminal identification and analysis systems, and hundreds of other items which materially affect the lives of millions of Americans.

CHARACTERISTICS AND INTERACTIONS BETWEEN OBJECTIVES

Many of the policy characteristics of these various objectives are presented in Table I. We observe that each objective has very different implications as to who makes the major decisions, who receives the primary benefits, and who pays the direct costs. Citizenship, educational utility, and social change are the only objectives for which decisions are made by the same person or agency, if we consider the state acting for society. Most of the other objectives have very different decision makers allocating resources, providing resources, and evaluating benefits. This diversity virtually guarantees an uncoordinated and inefficient operation, which will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter.

Furthermore, it is interesting to observe the differing roles of public educational planners or administrators. For some objectives, long-range planning is the key component; while for other objectives, a caretaking stewardship is more appropriate. For still others, the public need only monitor the activities and report these periodically in an unbiased manner. In other words, the appropriate degree of involvement and scope of responsibility borne by the statewide planners is very dependent upon their goals and objectives. Consequently, statewide planning and management systems should reflect the managerial roles and educational objectives of society in a mutually consistent manner.

Table II indicates the interactions between various objectives and includes an assessment of whether the objectives reinforce or conflict with each other or whether they have no effect at all (neutral). While the objectives of citizenship and manpower reinforce each other, they conflict with most other objectives. On the other hand, the utility, whole man, art form, and human environment objectives are mutually reinforcing. With this analysis, it is

easily understood why many public institutions focus on manpower and citizenship while many liberal arts institutions, public and private, focus on the more humanistic objectives. This analysis also illustrates the difficulties in instituting humanistic objectives in citizenship-manpower oriented institutions.

TABLE I.

POLICY CHARACTERISTICS OF ALTERNATIVE OBJECTIVES

Model Objectives	Who Makes Major Program Decisions	Who Receives the Major Benefits	Who Pays the Direct Costs in Public Institutions	Major Public Planning or Management Role
1. Citizenship	State	Society	State	Management
2. Manpower	State	Economy and individual	State	Planning
3. Utility	Student and institution	Student	Student	Management
4. Whole man	Institution	Student	State or student	Management
5. Human environment	Student and faculty	Student and faculty	State	Management
6. Art form	Institution and faculty	Faculty and society	State	Management
7. Social change	State	Society	State	Management

TABLE II.

INTERACTIONS BETWEEN ALTERNATIVE OBJECTIVES

Model Objectives	Manpower	Utility	Whole Man	Human Environment	Art Form	Social Change
1. Citizenship	Reinforce	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Reinforce/ conflict
2. Manpower		Reinforce/ neutral	Conflict	Conflict	Conflict	Reinforce/ neutral
3. Utility			Reinforce/ neutral	Reinforce	Reinforce	Reinforce/ neutral
4. Whole man				Reinforce	Reinforce	Neutral
5. Human environment					Reinforce	Neutral
6. Art form						Neutral
7. Social change						

82

CHAPTER 5

Alternative Managerial Approaches to Statewide Planning of Postsecondary Education

George B. Weathersby

OVERVIEW

If statewide planning is to change with the rest of the society, how is it to change? In particular, how will educational resources be allocated among competing institutions and according to what criteria? Chapter 5 offers two dichotomous approaches, one centralized and the other decentralized, whose relative merits and weaknesses are explored and tabulated.

By way of introduction, it is noted that currently in contrast to private sector relationships " . . . accountability [of public institutions] is a nebulous notion that is not only unenforceable, but also lacking in incentives for better management . . ." in part because ". . . for the purpose of planning and management, the fundamental difference between public-private and public-public relationships is the presence and absence of an enforceable contract."

One way the state can compensate for the lack of a contract with the institutions is to centralize the resource allocation decision making. Unfortunately, since very little acceptable data are available on educational output, such decision making has come to be based on inputs; and the criterion which has been too often adopted is the minimization of costs, constrained only by the institutional manager's ability to demonstrate a resultant decline in quality or quantity of output.

Alternative criteria which are explored include incentives based on degree output, faculty workload, and the achievement of graduates as measured by state or national testing standards. The trouble with these alternatives is that they lead ultimately to norms which are institutionally defined; hence, the attempt at centralization as currently practiced is doomed. Three preconditions to the viability of centralization are developed to circumvent the problem.

The other alternative to filling the contractual gap is for

the state to enable the individual to legally contract with educational institutions directly and to provide an economic environment which supports the goals of the legalism. Various financing devices are discussed and compared in relation to a number of different objectives.

INTRODUCTION

When an individual enters into a contract, he usually insists that the commodity or service he is purchasing be fully and accurately described and that its price be clearly stated. This detailed description enables the purchaser to hold the seller accountable for the actual delivery of the goods or services while limiting the financial cost to the predetermined number. On the other side, the seller has the assurance of receiving the fixed price for his goods or services provided they satisfy the description included in the contract. In other words, contracts serve all parties concerned, both in their decision making (What will I receive for an expenditure of x dollars?) and in their monitoring, evaluation, and conflict resolution (Did the other party fulfill his side of the bargain?)

Formal contractual obligations are the operational form of external resource allocation in the private sector. Suppliers contract to provide raw materials and intermediate components, labor contracts to perform specified work at a fixed wage rate, dealers contract to purchase the manufacturer's output, and so forth until the ultimate consumer contracts with the retailer to buy the finished product.

This private sector analogy has been carried over to public sector practice with varying degrees of success. Probably the most successful area of application has been public purchases of private products. In this case, the governmental agency acts like any other private person in the purchase of private goods or services (e.g., telephone service, automobiles, paper, clerical support, etc.). The least successful area of application has been the allocation of public resources to other public agencies, largely because the goods and services produced by public agencies and institutions are not fully and accurately described, and their financial cost is neither fixed nor determined in a market.

When a state purchases a fleet of automobiles from General Motors, it usually does not try to tell General Motors how to run

its enterprise. On the contrary, when a state purchases instruction, research, and public service from postsecondary education institutions it often intervenes directly in the management of those institutions. What is the difference? For the purpose of planning and management, the fundamental difference between public-private and public-public relationships is the presence and absence of an enforceable contract.* If a General Motors' automobile does not meet its design specifications, the state can refuse to accept delivery of the vehicle or seek recovery of monetary damages. But what can the state do to prisons that foster crime, schools that don't teach, police that don't deter crime, and welfare workers unconcerned about the welfare of their clients? In these contexts, accountability is a nebulous notion that is not only unenforceable, but also lacking in incentives for better management.

Faced with such nebulous accountability on the part of other public agencies, public officials have several alternative approaches to interagency and interinstitutional management. These various managerial approaches can be classified under the general categories of centralization and decentralization according to whether the focus of authority resides in one or many decision makers.

CENTRALIZATION

Without market prices and without an enforceable contract, the pressure of public responsibility inexorably moves statewide or national public officials to assume a larger role in the management of institutions of postsecondary education. This involvement is manifest in state mandated staffing and support formulae, faculty work load standards, required utilization rates for physical facilities, student/faculty ratio planning guides, and other standards. In general, these mandatory budgeting factors are relationships between various inputs to the educational process and are unrelated to the outputs of postsecondary education or the input/output transformation process. This is often in direct conflict with the institution's managerial responsibilities for orchestrating the various resource inputs to produce socially desired outputs in the most effective fashion.

*The main distinction is not the control per se but the predominant nature of the goods or services in the public or private sector. Intangible products are far less susceptible to formal contract than are tangible goods.

The essence of centralization in the management of postsecondary education is that input resources are allocated by a single decision-making group or individual independent of the actual operating level at which the resources are applied. However, the higher level resource allocation decisions will bear little relationship to the lower level operating decisions unless the higher level decision makers have access to essentially the same amount of data on inputs and outputs as the operating managers. This is one reason state and federal agencies have vigorously supported the development of institutional management information systems. Even with identical data, however, statewide higher education planners cannot be expected to reach the same resource allocation decisions as institutional managers, because they pursue different objectives and hold different values.

Currently, the data available on a statewide level are mainly concerned with input accountability instead of output productivity. Faculty work load, space utilization, and support ratios are all input measures which supplement the vast amounts of financial accounting data that are required by state and federal fiscal control agencies. There are very few measures of output that are widely recognized and accepted; therefore, there are very few data available at any level on the outputs of postsecondary education. However, without output measures, statewide and national planners literally cannot allocate resources in a manner that maximizes the benefits of higher education. Consequently, without the assurance that they are able to affect the provision of the desired outputs, interinstitutional planners have no option but to minimize the costs of inputs until institutional managers can demonstrate some diminution in the quality or quantity of outputs. This frustration, in turn, reinforces state and federal demands for more detailed input data, because it is perceived that increased control over resource use is the only path available for increased educational efficiency.

Ironically, what we are observing in the increasing state interest and participation in the internal management of postsecondary education is the nationalization of an already public enterprise. This involvement indicates that the former implicit contract between educators and the public through state and federal governments is no longer credible and that the public perceives that postsecondary education's house is very disorderly. In the symbol-manipulation world of political decision making, the roles of students and

faculty have fallen from their once-held position of respect and now connote all that is wrong with the "drug-addicted, treasonable, lazy, disrespectful youth who are molly-coddled by a self-selected group of effete snobs." State legislated faculty work load policies, federal requirements for stricter student discipline as a condition for further financing, and the use of the National Guard to control undesired student activities are attempts by external authorities to put postsecondary education's house in order by asserting executive authority at the operating decision level.

The question that is rarely answered, because it is rarely asked, is whether or not the nationalization of postsecondary education will produce a more responsive and responsible system free of current deficiencies and difficulties. While it is too soon to observe a definitive answer from the actual behavior of educational institutions, several probable results can be suggested.

1. We recognize that many input and activity (and some output) measures are institutionally defined and often determined by the decisions of individual faculty members. Therefore, when we consider the behavioral incentives of nationalization, this undertaking must be viewed from the perspective of anticipated faculty reaction. The institutional incentive question is discussed more completely in the following two chapters; however, we can indicate some of the managerial consequences at this stage. Work load standards based on faculty hours in class could encourage faculty to section existing courses, giving the same lectures twice to half of the former class each time and thereby doubling their productivity at little additional cost. If the state attempted to limit section proliferation, the faculty could give each of the mitotic sections a new course name and number, which divisions could only be controlled by an external approval process for all new courses. However, a workable procedure for external course approval is not only difficult, contradictory to current notions of academic freedom, very time consuming, and expensive, but it also denies academic managers the flexibility needed to meet rapidly changing student demands and knowledge or discipline structures.
2. Using an earned degree as a basis for public support raises yet another set of questions and problems. The fundamental question is: "Are all degrees comparable between institutions and

between fields of study?" If they are not comparable, how does one adjust the level of public support to reflect the relative values of the degrees awarded? Who has the courage, the authority, and the wisdom to identify degree programs costing far more than they are worth and then to modify those with redeeming virtues and finally to eliminate the weak sisters?

Some faculty members have proposed granting bachelor's degrees to all entering freshmen in the belief that (a.) those individuals only seeking certification would drop out immediately and save the public thousands of dollars; and (b.) those students who remain can seek a "true" education unfettered by grades, degree requirements, major fields, and other debilitating appurtenances of degree-granting institutions. Independent of the merits of this proposal, as long as the decisions associated with awarding degrees reside with faculties, the degree will provide a poor proxy for educational outcomes and an inaccurate guide to public resource allocation.

On the other hand, the public could choose to become involved in awarding the degrees by developing state or national standards for a B.A. in English, for example. In the United States, the public has already done this in cooperation with the professions* (the bar exam in law; licensing of medical practitioners, engineers, dentists, and others), while in Great Britain and Western Europe the state regularly sets the examinations for the various degrees (for example, the external degree awarded by the University of London). However, general state certification in nonprofessional academic fields is a major departure from current practice that could have far-reaching implications for the structure and financing of post-secondary education. Proprietary schools could enter the market because the prestige of institutional certification would have been removed by state certification. Undoubtedly, there would be some incentive for all schools to "teach for the exam," to focus exclusively on the testable fields and concepts of post-secondary education. On the positive side, an arbitrary but consistent yardstick would be available for interinstitutional comparison and evaluation of relative efficiency.

*Observe that professional licensing in the United States is controlled by the professional organizations, which raises the obvious problem of self-serving supply restrictions maintained through mandatory licensing.

3. Another major area of anticipated institutional response is the faculty-administration relationship. Currently, faculty who demonstrate an interest or facility for administration — or an inability to resist their colleagues' urging — are appointed to the major executive posts within an institution. While the "Peter" principle operates in postsecondary education and in other enterprises, academic administrators are on the whole adequate and competent, if not inspired and charismatic. In the loose confederation of faculty members in departments, schools, and colleges, the coin of the realm is collegial respect and a feeling of joint participation in a noble undertaking.

However, as the centralization of the management of postsecondary education continues, institutional administrators will become agents of state and federal decision makers whose values may differ markedly from faculty values. In this environment, faculty-administration relations will metamorphose into a labor-management relationship. We observe evidence today of the unionization of faculty, the representational elections in New York, the increasing activism of the American Association of University Professors and the National Education Association as bargaining representatives, the unionization of nonacademic employees, and even the increasing unionization of students.

But the path of bargaining leads us back, inevitably, to the roadblock of the contract. In industry, working conditions and job specifications are discussed and developed in minute detail, often broken down into the activities of each ten-second interval of time. In education, as in most other public sector activities, such detail is not only unavailable, but also, if developed, could well prove dysfunctional and counterproductive. While we may be able to write a detailed description of how Picasso paints a picture, we have little confidence that anyone else could take paint knife in hand, follow the instructions, and *voila*, Picasso! Similarly, we could list the activities of a professor tutoring a student in his independent study and hire someone to imitate these activities, but how do you breathe life and compassion into this mechanistic view of education?

This is not said in defense of what is wrong with postsecondary education — for faculty, students, and administration readily admit that the academic tree is in need of pruning and that some activities

need to be abandoned in favor of others not yet begun — rather, this is said in defense of what is right with postsecondary education. Just as in our discussion of the goals and objectives of postsecondary education, we possess an inadequate vocabulary to describe the significant activities and major characteristics of postsecondary education.

If the reader perceives a circular logic in this discussion, he has grasped the essence of centralization in the statewide planning and management of postsecondary education. The public is unwilling to continue unrestricted and virtually unlimited funding of educational institutions because it is no longer satisfied with the conduct of the institutions' students and faculty (breach of contract) and because the administration of postsecondary education seems economically inefficient and ineffectual in controlling unwanted behavior (lack of accountability). The centralization response is to withdraw delegated authority and to make resource allocation decisions centrally but usually in terms of institutionally derived parameters (faculty contact hours, students credit hours, or degrees awarded). Because these parameters are institutionally controlled and because the implicit contract is no longer observed, the state has gained little control over the broader system of postsecondary education and its claim on the public's resources. At this point the state can either attempt to establish external norms against which to measure institutional performance or to pass the decision-making authority to individuals or agencies that directly benefit from postsecondary education and allow them to evaluate the efficacy of the enterprise. This latter is a process of decentralization which will be discussed later.

Centralization is a viable alternative to improved statewide planning and management of postsecondary education only if the following conditions are observed: (1) All input relationships are described in terms of parameters determined to be external to the institution. That is, public resource allocations should not be based on institutional costs, faculty work load, or other institutionally controllable variables. (2) All output definitions and measurements are made external to institutions of postsecondary education. This means that reliance on degrees, student credit hours, and other institutionally controllable parameters will not achieve the public objective of accountability and more efficient management of postsecondary education. (3) Mechanisms for determining causal

relationships will be established external to institutions. (4) The relative valuations of these externally defined and monitored outputs are provided by public agencies and not by institutions themselves. If the state or federal government wants to increase its control at all, it must establish all four of the above conditions. Conversely, if any of these four conditions is not met, there is no guarantee that the state or federal government will have any control.

There are obviously both political and financial costs to a state for undertaking any of these four activities. Because any improvement in accountability and efficiency through centralization requires all four, they should be viewed as a package, and a state should decide whether or not it wants all of them to some degree or none of them at all, depending upon the perceived costs and benefits of each alternative. Clearly, the one decision that governments should not make is to undertake only one or two of these four activities — and yet this is the very thing that states are now doing with faculty work load, degree compensation, overhead recovery, and facilities utilization policies.

We will return to these policy considerations after the following discussion of decentralization alternatives for allocating public resources to postsecondary education.

DECENTRALIZATION

The other major set of alternative planning approaches to the statewide management of postsecondary education is the decentralization of the resource decision making directly to the user groups. Instead of the public collectively deciding how to measure and evaluate the outcomes of postsecondary education, it can somehow enable each individual participant to make these observations and weigh these choices himself. Instead of developing the managerial technology necessary for enforceable contracts for educational services, the state can provide the legal environment which encourages individuals to contract with institutions or other agencies for their educational experience. In short, the role of public authorities who choose to decentralize the management of postsecondary education is one primarily of structuring a supporting legal and economic environment and impartial monitoring of institutional activities.

While postsecondary education serves many clients, including

government, industry, and other educational institutions, we usually identify its current students as its largest identifiable constituency. Correspondingly, most of the proposals for decentralized management of postsecondary education revolve around enabling students to act as decision makers. The underlying conceptual analyses employed in these proposals focus on the simple economic description of a consumer purchasing various and sundry commodities at relative prices determining a functioning free market. In essence, with a given budget available and with the value system he possesses, an individual will purchase the amount and mix of goods and services that he can afford, maximizing his enjoyment. In general, if one has more income than previously, he will purchase more goods and services, although not necessarily in the same mix, and, if the price of one item increases relative to all other prices, a consumer will generally purchase less of the more expensive commodity. Of course, there may be offsetting influences when both selected prices and income rise and the quantity of the more expensive goods consumed remains unchanged. Finally, individuals not only invest in the future (savings accounts, bonds, capital purchases) but enjoy current consumption; given fixed resources a person must always choose between receiving some benefits now or greater benefits in the future. These are the basic notions of the economic theory underlying decentralization in the management of postsecondary education.

The two key variables which characterize the economics of a student's educational choices are the price to the student of attending postsecondary education and his (or his family's) income. When a student considers attending an institution of postsecondary education he must count as economic costs all school fees and tuition, books, and additional living costs that he would not incur working, and the additional income he would have earned had he begun or continued working (foregone income). For example, the net foregone income of an entering freshman might be $3,000 per year in addition to the school fees, tuition, books, and other incremental costs which might total another $1,000, for a sum of $4,000 per year cost to the student. On the offsetting income side, the student might have some parental support, personal savings, and a student aid package of loans, scholarships, government benefits, or compensatory work opportunities. Basically, statewide educational planners attempt to guide the development of post-

secondary education by selectively modifying either the price to the student of attending postsecondary education or the income the student has available or both. A variety of special full cost tuition, voucher, loan, or scholarship plans has been advanced to implement decentralized management.

Full cost student tuition plans have been widely proposed to insure that students recognize the public outlays associated with providing postsecondary education. Undoubtedly, this proposal is motivated in part by the public hostility towards social action oriented students who view postsecondary education as a staging ground for attacks against the dominant American culture. If the students want to blaspheme the tin gods of America's altar, they should at least tithe their fair share, or so the argument goes.

Another reason for charging students the full cost of their academic program is that at the current state subsidized price many students choose to attend a school who would not do so at the higher full cost. If a program is not worth its full cost to the student, whom many consider to be the major recipient of the benefits of his participation in the program, then why should the secondarily benefited public pay such a high price? Similarly, in choosing between alternative degree programs or major fields on the same campus, a student usually pays virtually the same tuition while the program costs vary by as much as a factor of five or ten. If a student faced the actual cost of these programs, he would weigh his choices much more carefully as he pondered not only the personal benefits of entering program A versus program B, but also the (now) personal costs of each program. Under such a policy, how many students would continue to enroll in $100,000 per year degree programs?

If for some reason too few students enroll in an academic program which is felt to be socially desirable (such as medicine, law, or education), the state can stimulate more students to enroll in that program by subsidizing the price of that particular program, thereby lowering its price relative to other academic programs with a subsequent increase in enrollment. If the state wanted to encourage the development of a specific program at targeted institutions, their programs could be isolated for direct, per student subsidies operating as direct offsets to tuition. If the particular school benefit is not of paramount concern, then field specific scholarships (such as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of

Health, the National Institute of Mental Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and others) act to lower the price to the student entering the field. The nation's current overenrollment in the physical sciences and technologies demonstrates that students may be quite responsive to financial incentives.

On the other hand, if the state is primarily interested in getting young people involved in postsecondary education independent of field or school, the various voucher plans lower the cost of education vis-a-vis purchases of alternative goods and services. Basically, a voucher is a check from the state payable to any recognized postsecondary education institution for some indicated amount. In general, schools can still charge a different tuition for each program but these prices will all appear lower to the student by the amount of the voucher. This will induce more students to consume more postsecondary education than they would at full cost tuition, without regard to any desired distribution of students by any salient socioeconomic characteristics.

To influence the composition as well as the size of the student body, it is necessary to affect the students' incomes as well as the relative prices they face. General scholarships, unrestricted loans, and employment opportunities all increase a student's income and increase his ability (if not his willingness) to pay for his own education. The amounts of these scholarships and loans are usually based on the financial status of the student or his parents and reflect, albeit indirectly, the institution's or society's desire for intellectually qualified young people from all backgrounds to have the opportunity to attend postsecondary education. Observe, however, that an increase in a student's income will generally be spent on rent, food, clothes, entertainment, travel, and other items as well as fees and direct, educationally related costs. Therefore, income subsidies may be economically less efficient than price subsidies, because the effects of scholarships and loans are distributed over all other consumption goods.

While scholarships and loans are often discussed together, their effects are quite different conceptually. A scholarship is usually an outright grant to a student with no future obligation for repayment, while a loan is a debt incurred by a student which must be repaid in the future, often with interest. During his student years an individual is justifiably uncertain about his future income and, consequently, will logically resist incurring indebtedness when

there are other variable alternatives. This dilemma boils down to who takes the risk. With a scholarship the public takes virtually all the risk, while with a loan the student takes virtually all the risk. Recognizing this, Zacharias, Collier, and others have proposed hybrid systems in which the loan repayment schedule is a function of the student's future income as well as his total debt — thus sharing the risk between the student and the public. Yale University, with the assistance of the Ford Foundation, has undertaken a major experiment in full cost tuition coupled with an extensive loan program. Furthermore, federal student aid appears to be concentrated in various loan plans for the immediate future.

The effectiveness of various alternatives ranging from proportional cost subsidies in specific institutions and in specific fields to loan funds allocated by social or economic need is summarized and compared in Table I, on a scale of Very Effective, Effective, Mildly Effective, and Neutral. We observe from this table that no alternative is effective for all objectives, that loans are less effective than either vouchers or general scholarships for all objectives (and loans are also less expensive than vouchers and general scholarships), and that at least one alternative is "very effective" for each objective. In other words, if the state or federal government wants to decentralize resource allocation to the students through the market operation of educational services, there is a variety of approaches available, most of which are relatively efficient in the achievement of some objectives.

COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES OF THE TWO SYSTEMS

As we have discussed, the winds of high public costs and internal governance difficulties of postsecondary education have scattered the straws of unquestioning public trust and of unquestioned public support. As institutional managers grasp for the few remaining straws while striving for some semblance of order, state and federal educational planners have available an array of policy options representing a wide range of possible managerial approaches. On the one hand, public officials could allocate educational resources to institutions using externally derived measures of activities, outputs, and values; while, on the other hand, the public could financially assist students as they purchase education at full cost tuition rates. The relative advantages of these two dichotomous approaches are summarized in Table II.

TABLE I.

Relative Effectiveness of Alternative Approaches to Decentralized Management of Postsecondary Education Under Full Cost Tuition Pricing

Objective to Increase or Improve	Institution Program Cost Subsidies	Specific Program Scholarships by Ability	Vouchers	General Scholarships by Socioeconomic Need	Loans by Socioeconomic Need
Size of institutional disciplinary program	Very effective	Effective	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Size of each program throughout postsecondary education	Effective	Very effective	Effective	Mildly effective	Neutral
General enrollment in postsecondary education	Neutral	Mildly effective	Very effective	Effective	Mildly effective
Socioeconomic characteristics of enrollment in post-secondary education	Neutral	Neutral	Mildly effective	Very effective	Mildly effective

TABLE II.

Relative Advantages of Centralized and Decentralized Statewide Management of Postsecondary Education

Area	Centralized	Decentralized
Who makes the global allocation decisions?	Governor, legislature	Governor, legislature
Who makes the inter-institutional allocation decisions?	Governor, legislature	Students
Who makes the institutional allocation decisions?	Governor, legislature	Institutional manager
Who decides activity measures?	Institution/external	Students
Who decides output measures?	Institution/external	Students
Who certifies?	External	Institution
Who evaluates the output?	Institution/external	Students
Incentives for efficient management	Public approval	Fiscal survival
Primary clientele	General public (voters)	Students
Degree of public control over institutional activities	Higher than present	Lower than present
Degree of public control over productivity of postsecondary education	Higher than present	Higher than present

CHAPTER 6

How to Get the Faculty to Teach

Jacob B. Michaelsen*

OVERVIEW

One of the most pervasive challenges to postsecondary education stems from the demand of its various constituencies that faculty members teach more and research less. How this might be accomplished in light of the current unresponsiveness of faculties to public pressures is the subject matter of Chapter 6. The proposal advanced is for the " . . . adoption of performance budgeting together with coordination, planning, and major allocation decisions at the center, and decentralized management of programs with both rewards and penalties depending on performance."

Performance budgeting is to be based on " . . . the program (as) the significant educational unit." Since departmental structures are inimical to integrated programs some structural changes are seen as necessary and the example offered is the creation of " . . . budgetary units that correspond to academic programs in the overall plan," thus allowing the relation of program costs to benefits. Three suggestions on how to change the context of instruction are made: (1) Resources should be made available to permit faculty to develop coherent programs. (2) Resources should be made available to units which develop promising experimental programs. (3) Resources should be made available to units which have developed successful programs, and assurances to the faculty should be given that contributions to such programs will be recognized in the promotion process.

The allocation of resources among programs should be done at the highest institutional level, and decision-making about individual programs should be delegated to those in charge of them. Finally, rewards and penalties (in the form of resource reallocation) should be instituted to encourage good program output and to discourage poor performance. Review criteria must therefore be developed. The implementation of review procedures, as well as the rest of the program,

*Associate Professor of Economics, University of California at Santa Cruz.

demand uncommon leadership, but such a plan has been partially implemented at the University of California at Santa Cruz, and the author's experiences there lead him to be optimistic about its success.

INTRODUCTION

"Teaching is still too little valued in too many colleges and universities." So says the Assembly on University Goals and Governnance of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The Assembly, chaired by Martin Meyerson, President of the University of Pennsylvania, in a recent report charged the nation's institutions of higher learning with neglect of their primary mission — education. The report has a strong exhortatory tone. Like the sermons of old in which the preacher admonished his congregation to cast out evil thoughts but did not tell them how, the report gives no indication to the faculty of how they might mend their ways. What keeps the faculty from meeting their teaching obligations?

It is a misleading and somewhat tiresome commonplace that academics are liberal about everyone's affairs but their own.* Among all the houses, it would seem, only theirs is in order. This apparent contradition between liberal, even radical, critique and conservative behavior has often been used to suggest that faculty are different from other groups which tend to be consistent to word and deed. Appearances are deceiving: faculty behavior does not differ significantly from other corporate behavior in one central respect, in all cases behavior is generally self-regarding.

Faculties do not innovate much with respect to undergraduate education because they do not see it in their interest to do so. Like other groups, they do plenty of what it is in their interest to do. The problem, then, is how to make faculty want to devote time and energy to undergraduate education.

The obvious but complicated solution is to make it in their interest to teach undergraduates. This paper presents an analysis of the problem of incentives in universities and colleges with some recommendations about how to improve matters. It begins with an overview of things as they presently are arranged and then goes

*For example, according to Clark Kerr, "few institutions are so conservative as the universities about their own affairs while their numbers are so liberal about the affairs of others." The Uses of the University, New York: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 99.

on to suggest two alternatives. The first alternative proposes a radical shift toward decentralized provision and control of higher education, using tuition and loan plans to give students financial power over their mentors. The second proposes a more conventional, bureaucratic arrangement in which, by means of central coordination and control, resources are allocated to achieve effective undergraduate educational programs. Finally, this paper tries to sketch out what is involved in achieving effective programs.

MANAGEMENT UNDER THE PRESENT SYSTEM — THE ACE SYNDROME

Just recently the American Council on Education published a report ranking the graduate programs of the nation's universities. The University of California at Berkeley was again rated first in the nation. At least two questions may be asked about this competition. First, what is it that is being measured? And second, how should an institution be managed to gain a high rating? The first question can be answered fairly simply: a university's rating depends on the standing of its departments; the standing of its departments in turn depends on the standing of their members; the standing of the faculty members depends on the quantity and quality of their professional output, and this output is chiefly of a kind that is easily attributable to those who produced it. The answer to the second question is more complex. An institution seeking eminence in the Berkeley mode should adopt what might be called the fragmented decentralized model of management. Such an institution will have an academic plan in which objectives are set forth; research, teaching, and public service are the standard ones with a gentlemen's agreement on appropriate weight for each. Faculty agencies will review courses, new programs, graduate programs, and promotions and appointments. Similar reviews will be made in administrative councils. These administrative reviews will usually emphasize inputs, such as student enrollments, rather than outputs, as guides to allocation. Administrative reviews will not be made with any regularity, but chiefly when some change forces the issue. Finally, these reviews will seldom relate costs tightly to objectives. Thus, management of resources will be fragmented with the consequence that the control over the use of important resources will rest principally with departments.

This prescription is also a description of prevailing practice. What, then, have the departments done with this control? They have not used it to develop undergraduate programs and support for teaching of the kind the Assembly on University Goals and Governance would wish. One could read the undergraduate breadth requirements found in the campuses of major universities as a peace treaty signifying to all that sleeping dogs will not be disturbed. What departments have done with the control can perhaps be characterized by a review of departmental behavior at Berkeley.

David W. Breneman's doctoral research in economics at Berkeley* focuses directly on what departments do with this fragmented decentralization. Breneman sought to explain differences in the efficiency of Ph.D. production among 28 Berkeley departments. By this he meant differences in time to degree and rate of attrition of graduate students among the departments. For example, Breneman calculated that the average number of student years per Ph.D. ranged from 5.02 years in entomology to 7.64 years in psychology to 18.78 years in philosophy.

He considers, first, an explanation of these differences among departments advanced by Rodney Stark (1966) in an unpublished paper that the variation is due to differences in financial support among departments, the natural sciences departments generally having the most resources. Breneman finds this account unacceptable, for, among other reasons, it treats departments as passive agencies, taking graduate students as they come and passing them through.

Breneman goes on to make a significant breakthrough by proposing that departments are active, rather than passive, agencies seeking to maximize the welfare of their members. While this is in the best tradition of economic analysis, a department is not, after all, a profit-maximizing business firm. What the department maximized, in Breneman's view, is prestige, and this objective stems from the motivation of individual faculty who, in their rational self-interest, seek prestige because, as Breneman says, "most of the objects that philosophers have recognized as desired

*A brilliant condensation of the dissertation entitled "An Economic Theory of Ph.D. Production: The Case at Berkeley," is available through the Ford Foundation Research Program in University Administration, Office of the Vice-President—Planning, at Berkeley.

100

by man — power, income, independence, self-esteem — accrue to the academic who successfully maximizes prestige."

How, then, do departments maximize prestige? Breneman considers two chief ways: (1) by having considerable numbers of prestigious members and (2) by placing its graduates in prestigious departments at other universities. At Berkeley, building a large, prestigious department is achieved by careful promotion and appointment procedures and by taking advantage of the way resources are allocated to departments. To perhaps oversimplify, until very recently full-time equivalents were allocated to departments on the basis of a weighted student input formula in which each increase of eight graduate students enrolled justified an additional faculty position, whereas an increase of twenty-four undergraduates were needed for a department to expand its staff by one. Clearly, departments could become large by admitting many graduate students, a relatively easy feat given low tuition fees, the prestige of the institution, and the culture and climate of the Bay Area.

But it is not feasible to make student output grow at the same rate as student input since the number of prestigious jobs available to Berkeley graduates is not within the control of Berkeley departments. Breneman explained the differential rates in time to completion and rates of attrition by differences in job opportunities open to graduates among the departments. Thus, graduate students are treated, in part, as a fee input to departments for their use in maximizing prestige. The same can be said, *mutatis mutandis,* for undergraduates. An old-fashioned word for this kind of manipulation is exploitation.

This is not to impugn the work of individual scholars and scientists as somehow tainted by this exploitation. And it is perhaps unwise for the pot to call the kettle black. The question we are compelled to pose is whether most of the nation's 2,500 institutions of higher learning, eight million college and university students, nearly half a million faculty members, and billions of dollars annually are all to be grist for the prestige mill. If not, how can redress for undergraduate education be achieved? The larger issue — how the level of total expenditure and its allocation between research and undergraduate teaching is to be determined — lies outside the scope of this paper. We will confine ourselves here to how a redress can be begun.

COORDINATED DECENTRALIZATION THROUGH THE MARKET MECHANISM

A useful way to describe this alternative is to review the highly polemical but serious analysis of recent events in the universities by James Buchanan and Nicos Develetoglou (1970). They see the chief course of the current sorry condition of higher education as the unresponsiveness of university faculties to their student and taxpayer clienteles. This unresponsiveness, in turn, stems from what they regard as the special and peculiar way of allocating resources in higher education. In this industry consumers (students) do not pay for the product, producers (faculty) do not sell, and the supplier of resources (the taxpaying public) has little control over the process. They argue that, in consequence of these peculiarities, resources are allocated so as to maximize the satisfaction of the prestigious research faculty; that is to say, the faculty is rewarded precisely for allocating its energy according to criteria set internally by the disciplines. The failure of the faculty to innovate is not due to inherent conservatism; the faculty does not innovate because it is not rewarded for innovation. There are no incentives strong enough to overcome those inherent in the present organization of the education industry to make the faculty responsive in a fundamental way to students, nor to any other nonfaculty group. Moreover, Buchanan and Develetoglou do not believe the faculty will "set its own house in order."

They believe that this fundamental unresponsiveness of the faculty, more than any other factor, is responsible for the disorder in the universities' recent past. Until 1964, before the effects of this unresponsiveness became apparent, the public regarded universities as a kind of secular church providing opportunities for tithing. The chief social benefit higher education afforded was the opportunity to support a worthy cause; there was no significant concern about the substance of this benefit that went beyond the attitude that education was a good thing and the more of it the better.

As a remedy, Buchanan and Develetoglou propose a radical shift in university finance, including full cost tuition and government guaranteed loans to students in place of direct institutional support, in order that the possibility of student dissatisfaction can bring financial pressures to bear on the faculty. In a word, they propose competition in the education industry.

102

A major change in financial arrangement of this kind appears unlikely, though considering the widespread research interest in voucher plans as means of making public schools responsive to their clientele, its time may come soon. Without going into an extensive analysis of how market decentralization would work,* one can assert that fragmented decentralization would lose ground and even disappear were students given the power of the purse. There is, of course, little direct evidence in the area of schooling, though there is much in other areas of productive activity. Experimentation is certainly desirable.

CENTRALIZED MANAGEMENT WITH COORDINATED DECENTRALIZATION

The problem before us, given the Buchanan/Develetoglou critique, is how to put the faculty house in order without being forced by the pressures radically altered financial arrangements would produce. The solution proposed here is adoption of performance budgeting together with coordination, planning, and major allocation decisions at the center, and decentralized management of programs with both rewards and penalties depending on performance. Joseph Tussman's classification of university educational programs is very helpful in considering performance budgeting in the university. He writes (1968:5-7):

> The program is the significant educational unit. Programs may be, and usually are, constructed out of courses. The course is a familiar unit for teaching purposes, but it would generally be recognized — and the quarter system has brought this point home — that a single course is a fragment and that much of its significance depends on the context of courses and other modes of organized intellectual effort in which it is placed.
> Graduate work — the third program — is a program of sustained study designed by the faculty as adequate preparation for teaching and research in a particular field or area. A Ph.D. program may involve courses, but it is defined in terms of the mastery of knowledge and techniques, tested in various ways, and is relatively coherent.

*For an excellent discussion of the problems involved, see Alan Peacock and Jack Wiseman (1964). The chief problem seems to lie in the differences in knowledge between teachers and students. Faculty, like physicians, know more than their clients, and clients cannot easily judge the value of this knowledge, apart from suffering the consequences of it personally. The trouble is that in both instances trusting professionals leads to very serious difficulties.

The upper division majors — the second program — while it may often be defined in terms of courses is, in principle and intent, a more or less coherent plan of study designed to give the student some immersion in the basic concepts, the problems, the lore, the methods, and techniques which characterize one of the great academic disciplines.

The difficulty is with the largely nonexistent first program. (We seem to cover the range from programs without courses through programs with courses to courses without programs.) The problem is, can we construct and maintain — largely within the framework of our existing resources — a suitable variety of coherent and appropriate first programs?

What we have now, instead, is a loose system of "requirements." These have a long history and reflect genuine educational considerations. But, I believe, there is general dissatisfaction with what they add up or fail to add up to. They are conceived as guarding against premature specialization by insisting on "breadth" (a minimal sampling of courses in various areas), as providing for the tools or skills a college graduate should have (e.g., writing and knowledge of a foreign language). To these general requirements are added those which departments impose as prerequisite for the upper division major — amounting, in some cases, to as much as half of the student's lower division course work.

The result is that, for most students, undergraduate education involves a single program (the major), supplemented by a variety of fragmentary courses. My suggestion is that we think of undergraduate education as involving two programs and attempt to reclaim the lower division years for appropriate first programs. "Appropriate" means at least (1) some measure of coherence and integration, and (2) an organizing principle different from that upon which the second program — the departmental major — is based. I also suggest that — for the sake of the integrity of the first program — departments be encouraged to claim a larger share of the student's time during the upper division years and, in exchange, minimize the lower division prerequisites for majors.

A departmentally organized university cannot easily provide a base for an educational enterprise, such as the first program, that does not center on disciplinary concerns and where the professional standing of the faculty is not significantly involved. This suggests that some structural changes are necessary, or at least highly desirable, if the faculty are to change their ways. More important than changes in formal organization are changes in the system of incentives. Not only must the institutional structure be capable of providing a home for the first program, but faculty must be "paid" to work in it. The collegiate structure at the University of California at Santa Cruz affords an example of such

a structural change and also provides a useful case history of the problems of developing incentives capable of overcoming those of the prevailing professionalism. Because of my familiarity with it, I should like to use the Santa Cruz experience to illustrate certain aspects of the rather abstract model of centralized management of resources advanced here.

It is not feasible, in such a short compass, to describe fully, let alone defend, the possible objectives of first programs. Moreover, there is much more to undergraduate education than the curriculum in the first two years (Adams and Michaelsen, 1971). Let us take it as given that the undergraduate teaching objectives to be furthered by coordinated decentralization would be supported by the Assembly on University Goals and Governance. Let us turn to a consideration of the changes in structure that could help to move the faculty away from the single-minded pursuit of professional objectives.

The most important requirement in restructuring is that the new units make it possible for the central administration to understand the resource implications of academic programs and to allocate resources to them according to an overall academic plan. As noted above, under fragmented decentralization the faculty develop programs and control resources in departments, while the administration initiates the allocation of resources on the basis of rules of thumb, such as student enrollments, subject to the political pressures arising out of the battle of each department against all. One possible way to achieve this objective is to create budgetary units that correspond to academic programs in the overall plan. The administration would then be in a position to relate program cost to program benefits and make allocation decisions on the basis of the educational objectives the programs serve; in particular, their contribution to the quality and quantity of undergraduate education. This means that not only must there be new structures for first programs, but the powers of the old structures and departments, concerned with second and third programs, must be drastically altered so that their activities can be judged and supported on the same footing as other program units.

It may be helpful here to describe briefly the structure of program units at Santa Cruz. The Santa Cruz campus of the University of California opened its first college in the fall of 1965. This year there are five colleges fully underway and a sixth oper-

ating under very modest circumstances. Santa Cruz differs from her sister campuses — those which also opened in the mid-sixties and the older, well-established ones — most strikingly in her departure from the traditional departmental organization of teaching and research. In the collegiate structure at Santa Cruz, each faculty member holds an appointment in one of the six liberal arts colleges and an appointment in one of the cross-campus disciplinary Boards of Studies. With the exception of those having studies near their laboratories, faculty members are physically located in their colleges. Undergraduates are also assigned to the colleges, from six to seven hundred in each one. They take instruction both from their college and from the Board of Studies. The colleges are headed by provosts, faculty members who play the principal role in planning and administering all aspects of the colleges. The Boards of Studies are headed by chairmen, who have little or no budgetary discretion, the bulk of the budgetary power for the disciplines residing in three vice-chancellors, one each for the Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Humanities. The program structure and the division of powers over resources thus correspond in a formal way to our centralized management model. However, this practice leaves much to be desired, as the following discussion will illustrate.

A structure which could facilitate first programs need not, by itself, insure their launching, let alone their success and longevity. Not only must a college faculty have the opportunity and the desire to develop a meaningful general education program, there must also be rewards for doing so. In the economist's terms, need is not sufficient; there must also be effective demand, and this means putting money where the need is. Collegiate educational programs at Santa Cruz have not as yet lived up to the expectations that many faculty members had when the colleges opened. It is fair to say that they fail on both of Tussman's criteria of appropriateness. They lack coherence and integration, and they lack a non-professional organizing principle. Indeed, in some instances, there is no visible organizing principle at all.

One generalization can be made about this state of affairs. It takes patience, time, and effort to work out a general education program, and the faculty chooses not to devote to this enterprise the requisite time and energy. They do not do so because: (1) they are apprehensive about taking on responsibilities in enterprises they regard as outside their special competence; (2) they are quite

uncertain whether they will be adequately rewarded for doing so; and (3) they believe that such an investment of effort cannot be easily moved to another university. Further, even if an individual faculty member is willing to bear the risk the incentive system appears to impose, he is impeded by the fact that others will not make similar commitments with the consequence that his efforts are likely to be largely wasted. However, it must be added that the collegiate structure does force important questions into the open.

What is required beyond the structural changes is an understanding by the central administration that it must manage the overall program and, of course, it must have the will to do so. While it seems clear that Santa Cruz has not yet achieved a satisfactory level of performance from the college faculties, we cannot conclude that such a level will not be reached. It is not easy for academic administrators to understand what a new structure requires under the press of day-to-day decisions on a growing campus in an environment very different from the ones they come from.

In more general terms, what is required is management aimed at changing the context of instruction from the individualistic prestige-oriented mode to the programmatic mode in which the needs and interests of nonprofessional students gain ascendancy. Beyond that, it will be useful to spell out the kinds of decisions which must be made at various levels to achieve the desired coordination.

The following are three suggestions on how to change the context of instruction. These are focused on the development of first (or in the terminology of Santa Cruz, collegiate) programs, because it is here that greatest strain for the faculty arises, since these programs offer very little obvious professional pay-off.

1. *Support for planning college curriculum.* Resources should be made available to permit the faculty of each college the time and other necessary support to develop coherent educational programs in which most of the faculty in each college could participate. Programs should be designed to take advantage of the strength of the faculty in terms of intellectual substance and modes of instruction. However, the programs should be designed so that a majority of the students will participate because they find them interesting and attractive and focused centrally on their own best interests in the broadest sense.

Programs designed to serve a few students with large benefits going to the faculty should be ruled out.

2. *Support for promising programs.* Resources should be provided to those colleges which develop promising programs in order to permit experimentation. A very important part of the experimental mounting of programs is the concomitant development of evaluation procedures, both in relation to the impact on or value added to students and to the quality and quantity of faculty contribution to them.
3. *Continuing support for successful programs.* Resources should be made available to colleges to continue successful programs. *Equally important is the provision of assurance to faculty members that significant contributions to these programs will be recognized in the promotion process.* Parenthetically, it should be noted that successful programs of this kind could be first steps in the development of the three-year B.A. as suggested by the Carnegie Commission (1970). It is highly unlikely that boards will make the kinds of innovations the Commission has proposed.

To get effective programs going requires a coherent system in which the relevant information is available to those whose responsibilities require them to make the important decisions and coordinate individual programs according to the overall plan. Each program unit then must provide a long-range plan which spells out objectives, resource requirements (especially faculty by number, discipline, and special interests), and a description of how the resources are to be used. The central administration must develop an explicit set of long-range institutional objectives so that the objectives of program units can be assigned appropriate priorities.

Of equal importance is an economic parlance knowledge of the education-production function; that is, a clear understanding of the relationship between program inputs and outputs. Such an understanding would require knowledge of optimum class size, methods of instruction, and appropriate material support. Since in the past universities have not taken the problem of efficient use of resources seriously, such knowledge will not be readily available. However, given reasonable first approximations, the central administration will be in a position to begin evaluating resource requests from program units.

Once priorities have been set, resource requests evaluated, and

an initial program mix established, staffing requirements can be derived. These will take the form of specification for new full-time equivalents. This must be done at the highest level because it is only there that a global view of the institution can be taken. If it is done in the form of bilateral negotiation between competing fiefdoms as in the departmental university, the result will closely resemble the situation Breneman described. In addition, the allocation of faculty time between first, second, and third programs must be coordinated at the highest level.

At the level of the program unit (provosts and board chairmen at Santa Cruz) the administrators must have the authority to use the resources to reach program objectives. For example, teaching assignments and teaching level cannot remain in the hands of board chairmen as they presently do at Santa Cruz. First program units must have the right to claim the time and energy of the faculty which has been allocated to them. The same must hold for other program units. All programs should be subjected to at least annual review which would compare the results of programs to their costs and make whatever adjustments were necessary between programs to meet the objectives of the overall academic plan. Resource allocation must be centrally coordinated within an overall plan, decision-making about programs delegated to those in charge of the programs, and good performance rewarded and inadequate performance penalized.

Rewards and penalties could take the form of increases and decreases in faculty time allotted to programs. It may help to give further examples of what could be done to encourage first programs. At Santa Cruz, colleges could be given explicit control of the promotion process, being delegated full responsibility for promotion and tenure for those faculty who devote at least two-fifths of their teaching effort to collegiate programs. Boards would only review the quality of the research of such faculty in a letter to the provost. In addition, colleges with successful programs should be permitted to take the initiative in hiring with advice from the board on competence in the field, but with the substance and direction of the candidate's interests outside their purview. This advice might be gained by small ad hoc or special committees chosen by the chancellor from among those able to judge the particular scholarly competence in question.

In the past year, the administration at Santa Cruz has been

engaged in a major effort of systematic planning and budget review. This could develop into the kind of coordinated decentralization just described and away from the fragmented decentralization which has characterized major resource allocation decisions on the campus in the past. It is clear, however, that the absence of programmatic management can be read by the faculty as a failure of will. The administration will be judged not by what it says, but by what it does. This is especially true with respect to its credibility regarding rewards for undergraduate teaching.

Once programs are adopted and resources allocated to their support it will become necessary to review them to determine whether they merit continuing support and to judge the quality of faculty contributions for use in the promotion process. This means that programs might be discontinued, an infrequent phenomenon in the university, and that faculty members might be judged wanting, a much more frequent phenomenon. To make these decisions, criteria must be established to judge program benefits and faculty contributions. These criteria will differ from the standards based on the individualistic models of faculty productivity.

It is clear that the liberalizing role of the university has been under attack from outside forces. Some would have us teach students "commonly accepted moral values." But there are other dangers closer to home. Some faculty members who might argue along the lines Joseph Tussman (1968:5-7) attributes to academic critics of general education programs would say:

> We are not . . . an institution for moral reclamation; we are not the spiritual arm of the political state. We are a secular institution of higher learning in a pluralistic society. We are not the priests of your invisible city. Moreover, this is a democracy, and a democracy is based on individualism . . . and furthermore — who are you — or we — to judge, to presume to teach virtue, to impose values on others?

This argument must be confronted. Of course, it may be that no internal consensus can be reached, that in truth "the center does not hold," and we are adrift. However, we have no right to conclude this before we have really tried.*

*There is the possibility that the problem of achieving consensus is less of conflicting values than one resulting from the bureaucratic entrenchment of individualism. It may be that only something like the drastic overhaul proposed by Buchanan and Develetoglou discussed above can really break the back of bureaucratic resistance to change.

If a workable consensus could be reached on objectives of collegiate programs and on the principle that this consensus is to be reflected in the level of resources devoted to these programs, it would remain to be determined how the performance of program and of faculty was to be evaluated. Evaluating teaching performance in departmental universities has long been an unresolved problem. We should not enter the "publish or perish" debate here. However, it should be noted that efforts to evaluate performance in standard courses are not new: the University of Washington has evaluated performance in a systematic way for many years. Where there is a will there is a way, and a good place to begin is with the fairly extensive amount of work that has already been done. Beyond this beginning the question of criteria will, in large measure, be answered in the process of developing and executing programs.

A final word on the probability of successful centralized management is in order. There is some chance that the faculty at Santa Cruz would seize an opportunity afforded them by the concerted efforts of the administration to support collegiate programs. Only time will tell. Nevertheless, the power of professionalism cannot be understated. The Santa Cruz campus is part of a national, indeed, international system, and the administration and faculty can have no direct influence over any but a very small segment of this system. Moreover, the tradition of academic freedom means that the university is decentralized in a way no other public institution is. Faculty time and energy are the major resources of the university, and they are largely allocated by faculty members individually. Indeed, if everything proposed here is put into operation, it will remain for faculty to choose between the alternatives. Promotion and prestige will still come from scholarly achievement. Like the French aristocracy before the revolution, the academic meritocracy, supported by the taxpayers, is free to do what it pleases. They will still be able to urge the masses to eat academic cake.

Success depends on the will and imagination of individual faculty members who can, if they choose, make the colleges work or, instead, give them the appearance of working while using them in a chiefly individualistic way. Whether they do this depends largely on the leadership and vision of the administration, especially the provosts who have been more or less implicitly grouped with the faculty rather than the administration. This grouping can easily be given too much weight. Leadership is, perhaps, the crucial

411

element, but it is one about which an economist can do no more than assert its importance. Given imaginative leadership, a collegiate campus can be made to work. More generally, centralized management of universities with coordinated decentralization can be made to work. We will not know whether this is more than a pious hope until it has been tried.

However, there is at least one caveat on the role of leadership in this centralized management model. Whether or not valuable undergraduate programs result from such a scheme — programs that would be as good as or better than those that Buchanan and Develetoglou imagine would arise under consumer sovereignty — depends critically on the vision, understanding, and will of the academics in charge of the central administration. It is possible for their vision to be faulty, their understanding to be deficient, and their will to fail. For this there may be no adequate remedies. Moreover, university presidents are appointed by men who may envision quite different objectives from those assumed here and which may be in conflict with the needs and interests of the student clientele. And finally, young men and women object — rightly, in my opinion — to the exercise of *noblesse oblige,* whereby they are constrained to depend without resource on the benevolence and wisdom of academics who have not in the past shown much of either. The Buchanan and Develetoglou scheme has the merit of giving young people the responsibility for their own fate, a matter of no small consequence if we are concerned about the proper education for free men in a free society.

112

CHAPTER 7

Statewide Planning and the Individual Institution's Response

Frederick E. Balderston*

OVERVIEW

The middle-man position of statewide planning agencies in relation to individual institutions and to state governments is examined in Chapter 7 with special reference to the likely effectiveness of the several agency structures and spans of control currently in operation throughout the country. It is observed that " . . . to make statewide planning and coordination both palatable and effective, those concerned should seek, to begin with, a definition of what is in the domain of planning and evaluation which compels the design of comprehensive plans and their enforcement." There is a necessity for open interaction " . . . not only between the head of the planning agency and the president of each institution, but between those concerned at staff levels . . . " if such definition is to be satisfactorily achieved and acted upon.

From the other side, institutions may seek to get around the goals set by planning boards by generating constituency support and government interest. State governments may also find it beneficial to go directly to the institutions to get desired responses to political goals. The problem arises because " . . . the coordinating agency is without constituency support for its own defense . . . " when " . . . working toward goals that **it** *. . . defines as the public interest." The level and source of authority and influence possessed by the planning body is clearly a delicate question the solution to which must balance institutional autonomy against the need for effective governance. Whatever solution is accepted, it is clear that the most important ingredient for the achievement of effective planning agencies in the '70s and '80s is the quality of staff personnel. What is required is a staff which*

*Director of center for Research in Management Science, Professor of Business Administration of University of California at Berkeley, Academic Assistant to the President and Co-President Investigator, Ford Foundation Research Program in University Administration, University of California.

is sensitive to the needs of state government officials and the balance of forces of the educational institutions and "... which can serve at a high level of competence a lay board which generally seeks to implement the assigned mission of the statewide planning organization."

Each college and university has a name, location, and a collection of buildings. It has its own methods of operation; its own stated and unstated rules for students, faculty, and staff; and a particular internal balance of forces and attitudes. It has a reputation with various constituencies: the local public, its own alumni, the academic marketplace, and in the larger worlds of employers, state politics, foundations, federal agencies, and mass opinion. Over time, the institution's situation and internal mechanisms accumulate potency, giving it staying power and some degree of independence.

In short, each college or university is an *institution*. Its president, football coach, faculty spokesmen, trustees, student leaders, business managers, and alumni spend enormous energy trying to preserve or change particular aspects of its operation or policies. The institutional objective they try to serve is the survival of the institution, by helping it in its mission and, sometimes, assisting in redefining that mission.

The commitments of the institution are expressed in such tangibles as an operating budget and a capital budget at least one year ahead; long-range plans for physical plant and academic programs; admissions policies and enrollment forecasts; and employment commitments of varying duration into the future. These plans, policies, and commitments once made have great saliency to both the internal and external constituencies of the institution and require that the leadership of the institution go through very elaborate and careful negotiations if it feels modifications are necessary. This is the internal situation to which the leadership of each institution must constantly have reference when confronted with the signals of comprehensive statewide plans for higher education.

Statewide higher education plans have dealt in far greater detail with the functions, size, and resources of public higher education institutions than with the private institutions in the state. Even to the collection of relevant data, private institutions have seldom had

reporting obligations as elaborate as those faced by their public-sector counterparts. These differences are based on the obvious fact that the public institutions are the ones whose resource needs are to be faced by means of state appropriation and whose admissions policies, growth, and academic programs are most subject to political influence via budgetary control. Nevertheless, the private institution as well as the public one is affected by statewide plans, if in no other way than through the effect on its potential enrollment and tuition level of the operations of public institutions which it regards as its competitors. Increasing enrollment and budgetary pressures are forcing more participation by private institutions in the statewide planning process.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STATEWIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATION ACTIVITY

A statewide agency may have all of the broad powers of governance over the public institutions of higher education in the state, including the legal powers to own and dispose of real and intangible property, the power to set the rules and regulations of the institution for internal operations, the power to set policies concerning admissions, and the conditions for granting degrees. It may have authority to initiate or veto academic programs, even to the extreme, as in at least one state, of approving the offering of individual courses. The agency having governance powers also has the power of appointment and dismissal of administrators and faculty, under established procedures; and it is responsible for allocating the institution's capital and operating budgets and for negotiating the levels of these budgets with the executive and legislative branches of the state government. Finally, its powers may include the setting of student tuition and fees.

Short of these powers of governance, the statewide planners may have more limited functions: (1) to set forth forecasts of needs for educational growth in total enrollment and the disposition of enrollment over institutions and programs; (2) to review budgets for capital and operations in order to validate them for the executive and legislative branches; (3) to review the role and jurisdiction of each institution and recommend solutions to the problems of articulation between institutions; (4) to review and approve broad academic plans of the institutions; (5) to review and approve new

campuses, new schools or colleges, and new academic programs.

Each function may be exercised, if it is exercised at all, with a degree of authority ranging from information and advice to the institutions and the state to outright power to decide; it may be exercised very broadly or in very specific detail. For example, the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, at the request of the legislature, has been studying how to tighten the detailed utilization standards for classrooms and class laboratories in the state colleges and the university.

The formal authority of a state's coordinating agency is explained in part by its history — the gradual accretion of duties and mandated obligations — or, in some cases, by a state's adoption of a design for a coordinating agency proposed by experts. Other contributors to this survey note the trend toward more comprehensiveness of agencies, both in the range of authorities and the number of levels of education included.

The influence, as against the formal authority, of the coordinating agency in the exercise of each of its functions depends, of course, on a large number of historical and political factors. In reviewing the response of institutional leadership to statewide plans, we will be discussing some of these issues of influence as they are currently developing.

STATEWIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATION AS A SOURCE OF GAIN TO THE INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION

Each public institution can expect to derive a well-defined role assignment from statewide planning. This is generally stated in terms of the degree-level of programs and the attributes of the students who, by the admissions policies laid down in the plan, are expected to attend. The stipulated role assignment fortifies leadership of the public institution in resisting external constituency pressures to do something else. The plan may, however, require a role for the institution which frustrates internal constituencies; for example, many comprehensive state colleges want to move toward offering doctoral degrees and advanced professional degrees even when this is not permitted in their current role assignments. An indirect benefit of mission and role definitions to both public and private institutions is that the functions of their competing and complementary institutions are also defined. This may

permit better forecasting of interinstitutional relationships, both competitively and articulatively.

Statewide plans may or may not contain quantitative enrollment growth projections and allocations among individual institutions. They may, rather, specify eligibility cut-off levels which do not then directly settle the quantitative questions. There are two possible benefits from projections of future enrollments for the individual institution. One is the increased degree of validation of its own growth plans and of its consequent resource needs. When stipulated amounts of enrollment growth are validated in the statewide plan, resource needs for this growth can be more easily defended, provided that there are agreed capital and operating budget standards. The other is that each institution may benefit internally by improving the coherence of its academic plans when its long-range enrollment expectations are firmly based on statewide enrollment forecasts.

Whether the individual institution has greater assurance of adequate state budgetary support under comprehensive statewide planning and coordination than without it depends on two things. First, will the comprehensive design of the higher education system of a state lead to greater willingness on the part of the political authorities to underwrite the resource requirements of that system than they would have in the absence of a comprehensive plan? Second, will the individual institution tend to fare better in detailed dealings with an educational planning agency for validation of its plans and review of its budgets than it would through direct negotiation with the executive and legislative decision makers? The individual public institution will perceive net benefit only if the statewide planning and coordinating agency having budgetary responsibility employs expertise and adequate procedural review in budget analysis, and if it is effective in presenting and defending the overall resource needs of the public higher education system.

These observations hold for the public institutions. The private institutions within a state, which to a considerable extent are affected adversely by increased competitive strength of their public counterparts, may necessarily see negative implications in resource-getting success for the public sector on the part of the statewide planning and coordinating agency. The one respect in which both public and private institutions may jointly gain from the statewide planning agency's efforts in validating budgetary needs is in plans

and budgets for student financial aid. Devices for increased underwriting of the financial aid needs of students, who can then choose to attend either public or private institutions, are welcomed by both kinds of institutions.

If the statewide planning and coordinating agency is fundamentally an information and analysis agency, its effect on the situation with respect to resources and budgets is much more problematical. The effect is likely to be seen as beneficial if from its position of viewing overall higher education requirements in the state and of having expertise in deriving information and analytic conclusions about what is needed the statewide planning agency reinforces resource claims of the various institutions either for direct support or for the funding of student financial aid. However, if the work done is of low quality or is done simply with a view to reinforcing the position of budget cutters in the executive and legislative branches, this can hardly fail to have negative implications from the standpoint of the individual institution and its leadership.

Statewide planning and coordination may be perceived as helping to reduce the amount of political interference into the policies and operations of individual institutions, especially if its work validates the definitions of mission, the budgetary requirements, and the educational policies and standards (such as those for facility utilization) of the individual public institutions within the state. The statewide planning agency is rarely, however, in a position to assist in fending off political pressures based on ideological and moral objections to what is happening in institutions. Thus, its role in dealing with the political implications of student unrest or academic freedom and tenure problems is likely to be extremely limited unless there is a strong and salient public figure within the statewide planning and coordinating agency who is able to serve as a spokesman on these issues for higher education as a whole. In fact, political considerations tempt both state officials and the academic institutions' leaders to by-pass the coordinating agency and deal directly with each other, especially in times of crisis.

Many federal funding programs for higher education now require that there be comprehensive statewide plans as a condition of eligibility for funding applications by individual institutions. The statewide planning agency gains power from this function and may perform it well, in which event the individual institutions will

perceive its activity as a significant net benefit in the securing of federal funds for capital, operating, and financial aid purposes.

Finally, the statewide planning and coordinating agency may serve as a locus of expertise and creative thinking in educating public decision makers and the general public about the changing needs and patterns of higher education and about the reasons these changes need to be regarded sympathetically. Performance of this function depends on whether the leader of the planning agency is a potent public figure who is able to address major issues of this kind in an effective way.

STATEWIDE PLANNING AS A PROBLEM FOR THE INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION

Inevitably, the individual institution sees loss of autonomy in the formulation of comprehensive designs and blueprints of what higher education in the state ought to be. Whether such a loss of autonomy is real or imagined, it is clear that another level of validation and clearance of plans has been superimposed over that of the decision-making process within the individual institution. This tends to make the top administrators and academic planners of the individual institution appear less responsive to faculty and student aspirations than they would like to be. It creates the problem for the administrators of being judged partly by their success as advocates of what the leading factions within the institution want. The president and other leaders are also only too aware that they must not only carry out plans made at a higher level, but assume the burden of explaining and defending to many publics what the institution is doing, not doing, and why.

As was indicated at the beginning of this paper, the president and other key people within an institution necessarily have a different perspective and concern for the institution than the statewide planners have. The president is often concerned for an adequate internal balance and composition of programs and capabilities. Statewide planners may seek to allocate programs and educational responsibilities on the basis of comparative costs among institutions within the system, disregarding considerations of compositional balance on any one campus.

The planning agency is likely to think in terms of a structural role for each institution within a predetermined schema. This may

result not only in disregard of the question of program balance, but in the tendency to meet demands for more kinds of programs by developing more kinds of specialized institutions.

The president and other leaders within an institution may need to respond to intense constituency pressures which are joined by strong forces within the institution, but the desired response may fail to fit the specifications of the statewide plan. For example, major public universities, and private ones as well, have made strenuous efforts in recent years to recruit an increased proportion of their students in the Black and Chicano communities. Frequently these students need large amounts of financial aid. Sometimes they do not meet conventional definitions of enrollment eligibility at the institutions in question. On a rigid definition of eligibility and enrollment standards, the leading institutions would tend to have very small minority enrollments, but this would be unacceptable both to the minority constituencies in the surrounding community and to the internal constituencies within these institutions. Statewide planning and coordinating agencies, however, may or may not perceive the validity of these needs for institutional response.

We must return to the question of institutional program balance as a case of conflict in perspectives between institutional leadership and the statewide planning function, because an increasingly widespread responsibility of statewide planning and coordinating agencies is that of reviewing and approving or disapproving proposals for new educational programs, new schools or colleges, or new research or public service agencies. A valid objective of statewide planning and coordinating agencies and a deep concern of executive and legislative decision makers in state governments is to avoid unnecessary program duplications and prevent the initiation of programs which will operate at very high unit costs or low levels of effectiveness. At the same time, the president and other spokesmen of the individual institution may see very good reasons, from the standpoint of the improvement of program alternatives for the students coming to that institution and from the standpoint of valid aspirations for faculty participation in new types of programs, to press demands for new programs even where they will have high costs in the early stages or be duplicative of what is done somewhere else in the statewide system. (Without saying so, the leadership of an institution which already has all of the program commitments and approvals it wants may actually welcome the

check placed upon new program proposals at other institutions by the necessity for higher level review of these proposals. This tends to decrease the potential competition of the already established and diversified institutions.)

What seems very problematical, however, is the quality of program review which statewide planning agencies are likely to undertake. For high quality, such program review should include judgments about the social needs of a long-term nature which would be served through initiation of the newly proposed program. It should include judgment about the academic merits of the program design which is put forward. It should include judgments about projected enrollment growth in the program and the availability of resource requirements to be secured from extramural sources. It should include judgments about the scale and cost alternatives that are, in fact, available to serve as a background against which to estimate the probable costs of the new program both to the institution and to society if that program is approved. If the statewide planning agency has the function of dealing with new programs, all of these considerations lead to a conclusion that there is a need for some form of open planning and review process, not for a process which is remote from detailed considerations of academic quality and institutional costs. Those within the institution are more likely to know about economies achievable by combining related programs than are those at a more remote level. Those within an institution are more likely to know how to secure both high-quality internal academic judgments of the merits of a proposed program and external academic validation of these judgments. Most of all, those within the institution are most likely to know what risks are worth taking to select and support the individual academic leaders of a proposed new program. These are personnel judgments which those in a statewide planning agency are rarely in a position to make.

All of these considerations imply the need to keep many elements of a new program decision close to the individual institutional locus, yet the demands for statewide planning and coordination and for validation of resource demands in connection with the new program tend to move program approvals to a higher level. To add to the irony of the situation, the institution proposing a new program has the needed detailed knowledge but also, frequently, a large quota of self-interest. It is a real problem for the statewide

planners to accord proper weight to the institution's assertions about the social need, the probable cost, and the expected quality of the new program and at the same time deflate for special pleading.

WHAT STATEWIDE PLANNERS NEED TO KNOW

To make statewide planning and coordination both palatable and effective, those concerned should seek, to begin with, a definition of what is properly within the domain of operating autonomy for the individual institution and what is in the domain of planning and evaluation which compels the design of comprehensive plans and their enforcement. The trouble is that "operating autonomy" is itself a slippery concept.

On the side of planning and coordination itself, the demands on a statewide planning agency which proposes to undertake planning and coordination in some level of detail are demands for rigorous expertise, fairness in the derivation of conclusions from analysis, and a willingness to spend a great deal of effort not only in collecting information but in disseminating it for the use and benefit of the constituent institutions, public and private, within the state. Further, where conflict of perspective is more or less inevitable, the statewide planning agency faces an obligation to adopt procedures which will at least make it possible for the institutions that are affected by a planning decision to participate in the formulation of the decision as well as to be very clear about the basis for the decision when made. These propositions then imply the necessity for detailed open interaction not only between the head of the planning agency and the president of each institution but between those concerned at staff levels. They imply, where academic judgments are involved, either a blunt recognition that the planning agency itself had better not seek to make preemptive academic judgments without adequate expertise or the recognition that it should call for these academic judgments from other sources than its own staff.

We are, of course, aware of instances in which statewide planning and coordination are in fact undertaken not by an agency separated from institutional control and institutional involvements but by a central administration of a multicampus institution. The forthcoming work by Eugene Lee and Frank Bowen (1971) for the Carnegie Commission, *The Governance of the Multicampus*

University, gives a considered and detailed review of the methods of operation of such multicampus institutions and the functions performed by their governing boards and central administrations.

These too can work well or badly from the point of view of both the state government and the individual campuses, and the leading constituencies and factions within them. One attribute which these central administrations do have is that they must find ways to settle the question of decentralization of operations and the degrees of decentralization and centralization of planning and deciding resource priorities. A danger of a statewide planning and coordinating agency is that it may become interventionist in such questions without having to take the onus of the mistakes that may be made or, for that matter, get the kudos of successes which may occur. A statewide planning agency may be in the position of the irresponsible but involved political bystander. This, from the point of view of state governments and of higher education institutions which are affected, would be the worst of all worlds.

As Lee and Bowen point out, states which have large, multicampus universities and, in addition, have established statewide coordinating agencies to deal with plans and intersegmental jurisdiction problems face another kind of difficulty: the central administration of the multicampus university must have and cannot give up a substantial planning and budgeting function and the support staffs necessary to that function. The coordinating agency also finds it necessary to develop staff capability for planning. This leads to overlaps and duplications in the resources allocated to the planning process. But the problem is deeper. Whatever the felt necessity in the state government for a statewide coordinating agency, both the executive and legislative branches may feel it necessary to have their own experts; especially for budget review, but also for the development of independent policy approaches which they can use. The result is that the total amount and cost of planning and evaluative efforts increases, because more is done at the level of statewide planning and coordination and no less is done anywhere else. In fact, the existence of competitive and parallel planning processes leads to increased work in reconciling and adjusting conflicts.

Statewide planning and coordinating agencies are also subject to by-passing on important issues. The institution that wants to do something opposed by the agency may succeed in generating enough

constituency support and governmental interest to obtain the mandate which the agency opposes. The governmental officials who want a particular response from an institution may have better success in getting it by direct alliance with the institution than by sticking to the coordinating agency channel. The coordinating agency is without constituency support for its own defense in these circumstances, because it is working toward goals that *it* (but not necessarily either the institutions or the political authorities) defines as the public interest. A strong alignment with the institutions makes the coordinating agency their agent and loses its credibility with the state authorities when they want to squeeze or intervene in higher education. A strong alignment with state officialdom not only loses the agency credibility with the higher education institutions but forces it to choose which political factions to align with and which to accept as opponents. The statewide agency may be accorded independent constitutional status as a partial solution to the problem of power, but constitutional status implies the responsibilities of governance and, thus, the policy and operational burdens of governance, and compels these burdens to be joined with those of planning and coordination.

It is not unusual, in view of their fears of the consequences of control via statewide planning and coordination, for important educational and political constituencies to insist that they must have statewide planning and coordination and then to do what they can to assure that it will exist on paper but be weak in fact. An alternative to this position is to seek an appropriate and limited definition of the role of statewide planning and coordination, in view of the perceived needs of the state government officials and of the balance of forces of the educational institutions within the state; and, then, to man the agency with the kind, size, and quality of staff personnel which can serve at a high level of competence the lay board which generally seeks to implement the assigned mission of the statewide planning organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, R., and Michaelsen, Jacob. "Assessing the Benefits of Collegiate Structure: The Case at Santa Cruz." Unpublished paper, Berkeley, Calif.: 1971.

Becker, G.S. *Human Capital, a Theoretical and Empirical Analysis.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Berdahl, Robert O. *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Berg, Ivar. *Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery.* New York: Praeger, 1970.

Boroff, D. *Campus U.S.A.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Bowles, Samuel. *Planning Educational Systems for Economic Growth.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Browne, Arthur. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination." *Long Range Planning in Higher Education,* edited by Owen Knorr. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

Bryce, James. "The Future of the English Universities." London, Eng.: 1913.

Buchanan, James, and Develetoglou, Nicos. *Academia in Anarchy.* New York: Basic Books, 1970.

California Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education. Staff Report. *The Challenge of Achievement.* Sacramento, Calif.: 1969.

Canby, Henry Seidel. *Alma Mater: The Gothic Age of the American College.* New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1936.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Less Time, More Options.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Commission on Postsecondary Education in Ontario. *Postsecondary Education in Ontario: A Statement of Issues,* 1970.

Commission to Study Non-Public Higher Education in Illinois, T.R. McConnell, Chairman. *Strengthening Private Higher Education in Illinois: A Report on the State's Role.* Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Board of Higher Education, 1969.

Conant, James B. *Shaping Educational Policy.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Cox, Lanier, and Harrell, Lester. *The Impact of Federal Programs on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education.* Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969.

Cross, Patricia. "Equality of Educational Opportunity." Duplicated. Position paper prepared for the Education Task Force of the White House Conference on Youth, 1971a.

———. "Planning for New Students to Higher Education in the '70s." Duplicated. Berkeley, Calif.: The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971b.

Dressel, P.L., and DeLisle, F.H. *Undergraduate Curriculum Trends.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Education Policy Research Center. *Notes on the Future of Education.* Syracuse, N.Y.: Education Policy Research Center, 1970.

Farmer, James. *Why Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems for Higher Education?* Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Froomkin, J. *Aspirations, Enrollments, and Resources: The Challenge to Higher Education in the Seventies.* United States Office of Education Document OE-50058. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Glenny, Lyman A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

———. "State Systems and Plans for Higher Education." *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education,* edited by Logan Wilson. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

———. "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education." *Campus and Capitol,* edited by W. John Minter. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

———. "Impact of Certain Federal Aid Programs on Statewide Planning for Higher Education." *Crisis in Student Financial Aid.* Proceedings of an invitational conference, Southern Regional Office, College Entrance Examination Board, Atlanta, Georgia, January 22-23, 1969a.

———. "Effective and Efficient Management of Education Funds — 1980." *Proceedings of the Central Association of College and University Business Officers.* 57th Meeting. Houston, Texas, April 27-30, 1969b.

———. "Doctoral Planning for the Seventies: A Challenge to the States." *Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education.* Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1970a.

———. "Institutional Autonomy for Whom?" *The Troubled Campus — Current Issues in Higher Education, 1970,* edited by G. Kerry Smith. Selected papers from the 25th Annual Conference on Higher Education, American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 1970. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970b.

Gould, Samuel B. "The University and State Government: Fears and Realities." *Campus and Capitol,* edited by John W. Minter. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

Halstead, Kent. *Handbook for Statewide Planning in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.

Harcleroad, Fred F., ed. *Issues of the Seventies: The Future of*

Higher Education. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Hefferlin, J.L. *Dynamics of Academic Reform*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Henderson, Algo D. "State Planning and Coordination of Public and Private Higher Education." *Educational Record* 47(1966).

———. "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 40, no. 1, January 1969.

Hodgkinson, Harold. "Some Major Conclusions of this Study." Unpublished paper based on *Institutions in Transition: A Study of Change in Higher Education*. Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970.

Huff, Robert A. *Inventory of Educational Outcomes and Activities*. Preliminary draft. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, January 1971.

Jones, Howard Mumford. *The Scholar as American*. The McEnerney Lecture, University of California, Berkeley, 1960.

Kaysen, Carl. *The Higher Learning, the Universities and the Public*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Lawrence, Ben; Weathersby, George; and Patterson, Virginia, eds. *The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement, and Evaluation*. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Lee, Eugene, and Bowen, Frank. *The Governance of the Multi-Campus University*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971. Forthcoming.

Levi, Edward H. *Point of View, Talks on Education*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Livesey, Lionel J., and Palola, Ernest G. "Statewide Planning for Higher Education." Draft of an article prepared in 1969 for the *Encyclopedia of Education*.

Lowell, A. Lawrence. *Report of the President of Harvard College, 1919-1920*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1921.

Martin, Warren Bryan. *Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Mayhew, Lewis B. *Arrogance on Campus*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

McConnell, T.R. *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

———. "The Coordination of State Systems of Higher Education." Speech given at Conference on Higher Education, Lansing, Mich., November 13, 1964.

———. "The Coordination of State Systems of Higher Education." *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education*, edited by Logan Wilson. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

McConnell, T. R., "The University and the State — Comparative Study." *Campus and Capitol,* edited by W. John Minter, Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

———. "The Context of the Articulation Problem." Paper given at the State University of New York, Buffalo, N.Y., March 23, 1970.

Medsker, Leland L., and Clark, George W. *State Level Governance of California Junior Colleges.* A special study authorized and supported by the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1966.

Meyerson, Martin. "The Ethos of the American College Student: Beyond the Protests." *Daedalus,* Summer 1966.

———, and Graubard, Stephen. "Assembly on University Goals and Governance." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 18, 1971.

New York Times. December 12, 1965, Section E, p. 11.

"Notes on the Learning Force." Notes on the Future of Education. Syracuse, N.Y.: Education Policy Research Center, February 1970.

Pace, C. Robert. *An Evaluation of Higher Education Plans and Perspectives.* CSE Report No. 51. Los Angeles, Calif.: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 1962.

Palola, Ernest G. "A Challenge for Statewide Planners." *The Research Reporter,* Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, vol. 3, no. 2, 1968a.

———. "The Reluctant Planner: Some Implications for Campus Autonomy." Address presented to the Faculty Association of the State University of New York, Syracuse, N.Y., May 4, 1968b.

———. "Statewide Planning and Students: New Conceptions of the Campus." Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the College Entrance Examination Board, New York City, October 29, 1968c.

———; Lehmann, Timothy; and Blischke, William R. *Higher Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning.* Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970.

Paltridge, James G. "Organizational Forms Which Characterize Statewide Coordination of Public Higher Education." Mimeographed. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, 1965.

———. *California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education.* Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1966.

———. *Conflict and Coordination in Higher Education.* Berkeley,

Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1968.

———. "Toward a Systems Model for State Coordination." *Educational Record*, Winter, 1969.

Parnes, H.S. "Manpower Analysis in Educational Planning." *Economics of Education I*, edited by M. Blaug. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1968.

Peacock, Alan, and Wiseman, Jack. *Education for Democrats*. London, England: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1964.

The President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy*, vol. 1, *Establishing the Goals*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Reich, Charles. *The Greening of America*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Riesman, David, and Jencks, Christopher. "The Viability of the American College." *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning*, edited by Nevitt Sanford. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

———. *The Academic Revolution*. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1968.

Russell, John Dale. "The Finance of Higher Education." *Partnership for Progress*, edited by R. H. Kroepsch and D. P. Buck. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1967.

Schultz, T.W. "Investment in Human Capital." *Economics of Education I*, edited by M. Blaug. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1968.

Smith, G. Kerry, ed. *The Troubled Campus — Current Issues in Higher Education, 1970*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Stark, Rodney. "Graduate Study at Berkeley: An Assessment of Attrition and Duration." Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Survey Research Center, 1966.

Tillery, Dale. *School to College: Distribution and Differentiation of Youth*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971. Forthcoming

Trevelyn, G.M. *British History in the Nineteenth Century and After: 1782-1919*. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1937.

Tussman, Joseph. "The Collegiate Rite of Passage." *Experiment and Innovation: New Dimensions in Education*. University of California, July 1968.

Whitehead, Alfred Norse. *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., a Mentor Book, 1949.

Willingham, Warren W. *Free-Access Higher Education*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

Frank C. Abbott
Executive Director
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
Denver, Colorado

Kathy Allman
Student
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Steven Anderson
Special Assistant to the Chancellor
State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Alexander Astin
Director of Research
American Council on Education
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Donald Axelrod
Professor
State University of New York at Albany
Albany, New York

Dr. F. E. Balderston
Vice-President for Planning and Development
University of California
Berkeley, California

Edwin W. Beach
Chief, Budget Division
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

Robert O. Berdahl
Faculty of Educational Studies
Department of Higher Education
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Dr. Arthur D. Browne
Executive Director
State of Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Sal Corrallo
Program Analyst
Office of Program Planning and Evaluation
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Ted Drews
Director
Higher Education Studies Branch
National Center for Educational Statistics
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Glenn S. Dumke
Chancellor
California State College System
Los Angeles, California

Carl A. Eklund
Student
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Charles E. Falk
Division of Science Resources and Policy Studies
National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C.

Gerald Faverman
Legislative Fiscal Agency
Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Louis Fiebel
Executive Director
Maryland State Board for Community Colleges
Annapolis, Maryland

Dr. John K. Folger
Executive Director
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Nashville, Tennessee

James Furman
Executive Director
Council on Higher Education
Olympia, Washington

Dr. Richard D. Gibb
Commissioner of Higher Education
State Board of Regents
State of South Dakota
Pierre, South Dakota

Dr. Ted C. Gilbert
Chairman
State Higher Education Executive Officers Association
Frankfort, Kentucky

Mrs. Dorothy Gilford
Assistant Commissioner for Educational Statistics
National Center for Educational Statistics
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Lyman Glenny
Associate Director
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Leroy F. Greene
Chairman
Assembly of Education Committee
Sacramento, California

Dr. Warren W. Gulko
Director of Development and Applications Program
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE
Boulder, Colorado

Robert O. Hatten
President
El Paso Community College
El Paso, Texas

Richard Holden
Division of Academic Facilities
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Robert A. Huff
Director of Training and Implementation Program
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Hans H. Jenny
Vice-President for Finance and Business
Director of Administrative Computer Services
College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio

Dennis P. Jones
Assistant Director
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE
Boulder, Colorado

The Honorable Bennett Katz
State Senator
Augusta, Maine

Dr. Lee Kerschner
Assistant Executive Vice-Chancellor
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Dr. Robert H. Kroepsch
Executive Director
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Ben Lawrence
Director
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Roy Lieuallen
Chancellor
State System of Higher Education
Eugene, Oregon

Michael Manning
Association for Student Governments
Washington, D. C.

R. Chapelle Matthews
Attorney
Athens, Georgia

Dr. Robert Mautz
Chancellor
State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

John W. McCarter, Jr.
Director
Bureau of Budget
Springfield, Illinois

Dr. William R. McConnell
Executive Secretary
Board of Educational Finance
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Dr. Leland Medsker
Director
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Dr. Jacob Michaelsen
Professor
University of California at Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California

Dr. Richard Millard
Director of Higher Education Services
Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado

John Minter
Program Associate
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE
Boulder, Colorado

The Honorable Lynn Newbry
State Senator
Ashland, Oregon

Dr. Charles Odegaard
President
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Dr. John R. Ottina
Deputy Commissioner for Development
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Ernest G. Palola
Research Specialist
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Lyle Phillips
Director
Division of Undergraduate Education in Science
National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C.

A. Alan Post
Legislative Analyst
Sacramento, California

Dr. Bevington Reed
Commissioner
Coordinating Board
Texas College and University System
Austin, Texas

Henry R. Richmond III
Law Student
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Dr. James F. Rogers
Division of College Programs
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Dr. H. Reed Saunders
Director of Evaluation
Office of Program Planning and Evaluation
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Frank Schmidtlein
Senior Research Associate
Division of Education Laboratories
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Homer Still
Chief, Bureau of Planning
Tallahassee, Florida

John Vasconcellas
Assemblyman
Education Commission
Sacramento, California

Gerry Volgenau
Public Information Officer
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Robert A. Wallhaus
Director, Research Program
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE
Boulder, Colorado

Dave Wanser
Association for Student Governments
Washington, D. C.

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger
Professor in Educational Administration
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Dr. George B. Weathersby
Assistant Director
Office of Analytical Studies
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dr. Cameron West
Director
North Carolina Board of Higher Education
Raleigh, North Carolina

Dr. J. L. Zwingle
Executive Vice-President
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Washington, D. C.

7542955000045200:
7M:1071:HIRS:2BA24